DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 261 **IR 007 267**

AUTHOR	Lotto, Linda S.; Clark, David L.
TITLE	An Assessment of Current and Potential Capacity of Schools of Education with Recommendations for Federal Support Strategies.
INSTITUTION	Far West Lab. for Educational Research and Development, San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jun 78
CONTRACT	OB-NIE-G-78-0103
NOTE	121p.; Educational Knowledge Dissemination and Utilization Occasional Paper Series
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Federal Programs; Grants; *Information Dissemination; *Information Services; Information Sources; *Information Utilization; Institutional Research; Scholarly Journals; *Schools of Education; School Surveys; Teacher Educators; Teachers Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Educational Information; Linking Agents

ABSTRACT

An extension and re-analysis of data obtained in a national study of knowledge production and utilization in schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) brings together a picture of the current effort being made by SCDEs in dissemination and utilization (D&U). Ninety-two masters level and doctoral SCDEs were assessed with regard to the mission of the SCDE in D&U, the organizational arrangements made by the SCDE in support of D&U, evidence of faculty involvement with activities or processes associated with D&U, and the resultant products of D&U activity in the SCDE. Likely responses of SCDEs to four generic federal intervention strategies in D&U (training grants, capacity building grants, networking grants, and comprehensive dissemination system grants) were generated from the interaction of four sets of variables: the characteristics of the federal interventions, the current involvement of SCDEs in D&U, contextual characteristics of SCDEs, and external impact factors which are currently affecting SCDEs. These predictions were used to formulate a set of recommendations for effective support of D&U capacity in SCDEs. Recommendations were made for each intervention and a set of start-up points for a federal program supporting D&U in SCDEs. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171261

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT AND POTENTIAL CAPACITY OF SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEDERAL SUPPORT STRATEGIES

Linda S. Lotto
School of Education
Indiana University

David L. Clark
School of Education
Indiana University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

June 1978

FAR WEST LABORATORY
FOR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
1855 FOLSOM STREET ~ SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94103 ~ (415) 565-3000

IR007267

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES..... v

FOREWORD..... vii

PREFACE..... xi

ABSTRACT..... xv

I. CURRENT INVOLVEMENT OF SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION..... 1

Orientation to the Data..... 1
Population and Sample..... 1
Data Sources..... 4
Data Treatment..... 4
Institutional Mission: Are SCDEs Committed to D&U..... 5
A Profile of Commitment by Institutional Type..... 6
Summary..... 8
Organizational Arrangements: Are SCDEs Organized to Carry Out D&U Programs?..... 8
Formal Institutional Structures..... 9
Personnel Policies in Support of D&U..... 11
Summary Grouping by Organizational Arrangements..... 14
Process Measures: Are SCDE Faculty Engaged in D&U Activities?..... 17
Summary..... 18
Productivity Measures: Are SCDEs Producing in D&U?..... 20
Productivity of Institutional Groups..... 22
Summary..... 22
A Typology of SCDE Involvement in Dissemination and Utilization..... 24
Summary..... 25

II. SETTING THE STAGE: LIKELY FEDERAL INTERVENTION STRATEGIES AND CRITICAL DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF SCDEs..... 27

Four Federal Intervention Strategies in D&U..... 27
Training Program..... 28
Capacity Building Grants..... 29
Organizational Networks..... 29
Comprehensive Dissemination Systems..... 30
Current Involvement of SCDEs in D&U..... 32
Contextual Factors Influencing Schools of Education..... 33
External Impact Factors Influencing Schools of Education..... 36

III. LIKELY RESPONSES OF SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION TO FEDERAL INTERVENTION STRATEGIES IN EDUCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION..... 39

Predicted Responses to Training Strategy..... 39
Predicted Responses to Capacity Building Grants Strategy..... 41
Predicted Responses to Network Strategy..... 43
Predicted Responses to Comprehensive Dissemination Strategy..... 45

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEDERAL INTERVENTION STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION PROGRAMS IN SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION..... 47

Recommendations for D&U Training Program Grants to SCDEs..... 47
Recommendations for Capacity Building Grants to SCDEs..... 49
Recommendations for Networking Grants to SCDEs..... 51
Recommendations for Comprehensive Dissemination System Grants to SCDEs..... 55
Summary: A Beginning..... 56

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: TECHNICAL NOTES..... A-1

APPENDIX B: EXEMPLARY DESCRIPTIONS..... B-1

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Commitment of SCDEs to D&U Activities by Institutional Type for the Study Sample and Population..... 7

TABLE 2: Percentage of SCDEs Maintaining at Least One Formal Organizational D&U Unit and the Total Number of Such Units by Institutional Types..... 10

TABLE 3: Importance of D&U for Faculty Evaluation in SCDEs by Institutional Type..... 13

TABLE 4: Level of Support for D&U Through Organizational Arrangements in SCDEs by Institutional Type..... 15

TABLE 5: Level of SCDE Productivity in D&U by Institutional Type..... 19

TABLE 6: Level of SCDE Productivity in D&U by Institutional Type..... 23

TABLE 7: Classification of SCDEs by Involvement in D&U for Institutional Types..... 26

TABLE 8: Selected Contextual Factors Likely to Affect SCDE Involvement in D&U..... 35

TABLE 9: Selected External Factors Likely of Affect SCDE Involvement in D&U..... 37

FOREWORD

This Occasional Paper Series is the result of a collaborative effort among the National Institute of Education, the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, and students and practitioners of educational dissemination. Each of the papers in the series will be related to the dissemination and utilization of educational information and will reflect the continuing interest and activities of both NIE and Far West Laboratory in this area of educational research and practice. In some instances, the paper will be prepared by Far West Laboratory research staff; in others, the Laboratory will commission papers by practitioners and scholars in the field. Many of the papers will provide the basis for, or will be the result of, a series of dissemination conferences involving educational dissemination sponsors, dissemination project managers and staff, school practitioners and scholars concerned with educational improvement.

The major goal of the series is to define areas of agreement and disagreement within the research, development, and practice communities on those factors which are most important in supporting the process of educational improvement. Among the factors to be considered are activities of staff involved in dissemination, the organization and operation of dissemination programs, and the organization and operation of school systems. The papers also will examine basic aspects of dissemination such as the spread and exchange of information, the use of information in program planning, and the provision of training and consultation to help implement program improvements.

One of NIE's goals is to help build support services for schools and school systems which are attempting to improve educational practice. The papers in this series are particularly related to two of the many Institute efforts directed toward this goal: the interpretation of research for practitioners and the training and support of linking agents.

The papers and the processes used in their preparation are related to the NIE knowledge analysis and interpretation project which encourages the analysis, systhesis, and interpretation of research findings for application in educational practice. Although there is no consensus on how this process of analysis/systhesis/interpretation should be carried out, we assume that it is not solely an intellectual process but includes an emphasis on agreement among persons with different personal and organizational commitments.

In addition, we expect the papers to contribute to the conceptual base for the NIE-funded Linkage Support Service, which is intended to collect, organize, and convey information about linker training materials and human resources to those involved in linkage programs. We expect the consultation and training experience of the Linkage Support Service to keep the papers tied to reality, and we expect the ideas in the papers to help in describing and making sense of the experience of linking agents and agencies. agencies.

The papers are the continuation of an interpretation activity which began in June 1975 with Dr. Philip Piele's review of the literature on linking functions and linker training. That review and the resulting discussions highlighted a number of problems in the available literature: (a) the important system variables which influence change and improvement in schools are not seen as related to the functions of linking agents; (b) there is little attention to the nature and quality of the information to be conveyed to practitioners; (c) linking tends to be equated with change and with adoption of innovations rather than with support to program improvement efforts; (d) the role of the school administrator in the linking process is often ignored; (e) the functions of information provision, technical assistance provision, and helping the school system build its capacity to assess and improve education are usually seen as separate and unintegrated roles; and, finally, (f) there is relatively little research on the functions of the linking agent.

Based on that review, it appeared that an understanding of the educational improvement process required attention to the impact of the school administrator and the school as an organization as well as to the role of the linking agent. Subsequent activities have attempted to take such a balanced perspective. In 1977, the University Council for Educational Administration published a set of papers entitled Linking Processes in Educational Improvement. That book drew upon research and experience to look more carefully at processes of educational improvement from the perspectives of the types of knowledge available, the functions of the linking agent, and the functions of the administrator.

The current Occasional Paper Series is a further effort to identify and understand the ways in which different organizations and people relate in the complex process of encouraging educational improvement. These papers are expected to examine the most recent research and experience in order to arrive at a series of statements which can provide guidance for practitioners and policy makers involved in educational dissemination. In conducting such examinations and making such statements, we are sensitive to competing needs: to simplify a very complex field, and to avoid simplification which is not a useful representation of reality. Although we do not expect these papers to provide a final statement on any of the issues addressed, we hope that they will move us a step closer to an understanding of the crucial and complex problems of supporting individuals and organizations in their efforts to improve educational practice.

This paper by Lotto and Clark is useful background for all persons involved in educational improvement efforts. The paper highlights the current and potentially expanded role of schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) in dissemination efforts. It also points out some of the factors which tend to interfere with SCDEs taking an active and creative role in such efforts.

These interfering factors include the resistance of SCDEs, like many institutions, to change. The apparent extent of that resistance suggests that SCDEs may only take on an expanded dissemination and utilization (D&U) role with the support of state and federal funds and mandates for such involvement.

In some states, SCDEs are already expected to play a role in new accountability and improvement processes. That role often includes joint work with school districts in staff development.

In reading this paper, it is important to realize that the original study on which the report is based did not attend to preservice and inservice training of school staff. The discussion in this report appears, then, to exclude teacher and administrator training as part of the D&U process. Although this is not the view of the authors, it is worth noting that many persons do take that position. Indeed, such a view of preservice training is consistent with the impression that preservice training has relatively little impact on subsequent teaching behavior.

The Clark and Lotto paper is a reminder that many SCDEs do have a commitment to dissemination and utilization of knowledge. This paper also reminds the reader of the general isolation of preservice training from other D&U activities in universities, school districts, and state education agencies. The apparent lack of impact of teacher and administrator training might be taken as evidence that there is a need for more effective integration of preservice training with school district efforts at program improvement and with other dissemination efforts to support program improvement. As mentioned earlier, such an integration is beginning to happen in some states.

There is continuing concern in schools and funding agencies that research and development, as well as preservice training, are not responsive to needs of the practice community. More active involvement of SCDEs in the program improvement efforts of schools and intermediate service agencies should help to assure that SCDEs are aware of school needs and the kinds of information which can be useful to educators.

The data from the original Clark and Guba study make clear that SCDEs are doing things in dissemination and utilization. Those data, however, do not indicate how much time SCDEs and individual faculty spend in dissemination and utilization activities. Equally important, the data do not indicate specific activities and how those relate to other program improvement efforts. The implications and recommendations appear sound, but we must recall that they are based on limited data. If a serious effort is to be made to involve SCDEs in dissemination, there must be more detailed data on what is now happening and how it is related to university, state, and school district guidelines and funding policies.

Spencer A. Ward

Research & Educational Practice
Dissemination & Improvement of Practice
National Institute of Education

Washington, D.C.
June 1978

PREFACE

This report is one of several efforts to increase our understanding of the nature of educational linkage in terms of the roles and functions both of linking agents and existing educational agencies. The analysis of present and potential capacity of schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) for involvement in educational dissemination and utilization(D&U) is based on re-examination of data gathered during 1974-1976 by David Clark and Egon Guba for an NIE-sponsored study, Research on Institutions of Teacher Education (RITE). Although the RITE study produced some data on SCDE involvement in D&U, the emphasis was clearly on knowledge production (e.g., research) rather than on knowledge dissemination and utilization. Much of the descriptive data which was relevant to organizational arrangements for and programs in D&U could not be coded and thus were not analyzed. The completion of that study and the availability of the data to Lotto and Clark made feasible the present study which provides a previously unavailable data base on SCDE D&U activities and arrangements. In order to extend the analysis beyond present SCDE status to assess the impact of possible federal interventions on SCDEs, Lotto and Clark adapted a technique employed in the RITE study to analyze the impact of four sets of variables on the future involvement of SCDEs in D&U. The four sets of variables are: current SCDE programs and resources in D&U, feasible federal interventions, contextual factors of SCDEs, and external impact factors other than federal interventions in D&U which are relevant to SCDE futures.

In Section I, the authors summarize their data on the current level of SCDE involvement in, and commitment to, programs and activities directed toward the dissemination and utilization of knowledge in education by SCDEs.

In Section II they have selected for analysis four federal programs of support for educational D&U which are operative or are being discussed as likely new programs. A salient characteristic of all these programs is that they have been designed with little attention to the role which might be played by SCDEs. Employing the normative data from Section I, and considering internal and external impact factors affecting the near future of SCDEs, Lotto and Clark assess the most likely responses to, and effects of, such programs if they were re-designed on the assumption that SCDEs could be involved as productive agencies in support of educational D&U.

Section III presents a set of recommendations for the involvement of SCDEs in a national program of support for educational D&U. The two appendices should be considered integral sections of the paper. The "Technical Appendix" specifies the methodology employed in Section I for the reader especially concerned with the methodology of the study. The "Exemplary Appendix" includes illustrations of the data supplied by SCDEs in reporting on their D&U programs, and reference to this appendix can add depth to the reader's understanding of what SCDEs are doing currently in D&U.

Two clarifications about the emphasis and focus of this paper are in order. First, the emphasis throughout this paper is upon one educational agency and its relationship to effective dissemination and utilization in education--the SCDE. This may create a sense of over-emphasis on the role SCDEs can play in this field. There is no intent to foster such an emphasis. The authors are committed to the proposition that an effective D&U system will emerge only if all the operating agencies in education (e.g., state education agencies, local education agencies, intermediate service agencies, Labs and Centers) become involved in D&U activities and are supported in those efforts

by a progressive federal policy in this field. The purpose of this paper is to highlight a potentially effective role for one set of agencies which should be involved; agencies in regard to which the authors have data and expertise.

Second, descriptions of present SCDE D&U capacity are focused on activities and programs which were in addition to regular preservice, inservice, and graduate training programs and activities. This should not be taken as a lack of the authors' interest in the role that training programs might play in D&U efforts. Rather, Lotto and Clark have restricted their descriptions to those activities and programs for which data was available from the RITE study.

June 1978

Paul D. Hood
Carolyn S. Cates

ABSTRACT

AN ASSESSMENT OF CURRENT AND POTENTIAL CAPACITY OF SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEDERAL SUPPORT STRATEGIES

An extension and re-analysis of data obtained in a national study of knowledge production and utilization in schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) brings together, for the first time, a picture of the current effort being made by SCDEs in dissemination and utilization (D&U). Ninety-two masters level and doctoral SCDEs were assessed with regard to: 1) the mission or goal emphasis of the SCDE in D&U; 2) the organizational arrangements made by the SCDE in support of D&U; 3) evidence of faculty involvement with activities or processes associated with D&U; and 4) the resultant products of D&U activity in the SCDE. These four assessments were combined to arrive at a summary portrayal of SCDE involvement with D&U. Projections were made from the sample to the population of masters level and doctoral SCDEs and observations were made based on sub-group analysis of these institutions.

The likely responses of SCDEs to four generic federal intervention strategies in D&U, i.e., training grants, capacity building grants, networking grants, and comprehensive dissemination system grants, were generated from the interaction of four sets of variables: 1) the characteristics of the federal interventions; 2) the current involvement of SCDEs in D&U; 3) contextual characteristics of SCDEs; and 4) external impact factors which are currently affecting SCDEs. These predictions were used to formulate a set of recommendations for effective support of D&U capacity in SCDEs. Recommendations were made for 1) each intervention and 2) a set of start-up points for a federal program supporting D&U in SCDEs.

June 1978

Linda S. Lotto
David L. Clark

I. CURRENT INVOLVEMENT OF SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION

This section is based on data gathered during 1974-1976 by one of the authors in a national study of knowledge production and utilization in SCDEs.[1] It represents a substantial extension of the analysis of those data and, for the first time, brings together a picture of the current effort being made by schools of education in D&U. This re-analysis seems justified currently not only because it adds to what is known about SCDEs, but because the federal investment in education has been emphasizing, and is likely to continue to emphasize, the expansion and improvement of the D&U capacity in education in the United States. A brief orientation to the data follows.

Orientation to the Data

Population and Sample. The population of SCDEs in the United States in 1976 consisted of 1,367 institutions. The population chosen for this study is a sub-set of 671 of these institutions. Eliminated from the population were 642 SCDEs offering only a baccalaureate degree in education and 54 SCDEs with specialized characteristics, e.g., no resident faculty, seminaries, music and business colleges. This truncation of the population was based upon evidence from the Research on Institutions of Teacher Education (RITE) study that these locations were so unlikely to be involved in D&U activities

---

[1] David L. Clark and Egon G. Guba, A Study of Teacher Education Institutions As Innovators, Knowledge Producers, and Change Agencies (Indiana University: Bloomington, Indiana), National Institute of Education Project No. 4-0752, April 30, 1977, referred to hereafter as the RITE (Research on Institutions of Teacher Education) report. ED 139 805.

that their inclusion was unnecessary to portray a national picture of SCDE activities in D&U.[2] The population discussed in this report, then, consists of 671 SCDEs.

The sample utilized consists of 92 SCDEs and is reasonably adequate for the purposes of this study.[3] Data are reported for eight institutional types as follows:

A-Publics - Public Research Center Institutions (N=23). A sub-group of public doctoral level SCDEs identified in previous studies of educational R&D activity as among the leading producers in the country; and/or through studies of perceptions held by deans or faculty members in SCDEs as leading centers of graduate study in education.

A-Privates - Private Research Center Institutions (N=11). A sub-group of private doctoral level SCDEs with other characteristics the same as the A-Publics.

B-Publics - Public Institutions for Advanced Graduate Study (N=89). Other public doctoral level SCDEs not involved in the research center category described above.

B-Privates - Private Institutions for Advanced Graduate Study (N=30). Privately controlled counterpart to the B-Publics.

C-Publics - Public Pre/In-Service Teacher Education Centers (N=183). Public masters level SCDEs with strong commitments to programs in teacher education which prepare a large proportion of the nation's elementary and secondary school teachers. These institutions manifest their program commitment to teacher education through such viable characteristics as membership in the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and accreditation by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education at the masters level.

---

[2] For a summary of the level of involvement of baccalaureate SCDEs in either knowledge production or knowledge utilization activities, see Clark and Guba, op. cit., p. V - 39.

[3] Details on the sample and sampling procedures are available in Clark and Guba, op. cit., Appendix B.

C-Privates - Private Pre/In-Service Teacher Education Centers (N=75). Private counterparts to the C-Publics.

D-Publics - Other Public Pre/In-Service Teacher Education Institutions (N=91). Other public masters level SCDEs not included in the teacher education center category noted above.

D-Privates - Other Private Pre/In-Service Teacher Education Institutions (N=169). Private counterparts to the D-Publics.

The sample size for each of these institutional types and the total number of institutions represented by the sample were as follows:

	Sample	Population
A-Publics	7	23
A-Privates	5	11
B-Publics	19	89
B-Privates	8	30
C-Publics	25	183
C-Privates	13	75
D-Publics	8	91
D-Privates	7	169
Total	92	671

A basic sampling decision made in the RITE study was to employ limited resources to search for activities in R&D and D&U within institutional categories where they were most likely to be found, i.e., to sample the categories differentially. This decision was, of necessity, carried over to the present inquiry. The eight institutional groupings are being retained for the analysis and projection of D&U activities in this report not only because such institutional characteristics are inherently interesting and useful for policy planning purposes, but to guard against overly optimistic projections of D&U activities for degree level types which were less heavily sampled precisely

because they were less likely to be involved in such activities. For example, to combine the C and D-Publics into a single category for purposes of D&U projections for masters level public SCDEs would almost surely lead to overestimation of involvement on the part of the D-Publics since almost twice as many C-Publics were sampled and were predicted to be more heavily involved in knowledge production and utilization (KPU) activities.

Data Sources. The primary sources of data were institutional questionnaires returned by 92 SCDEs and faculty questionnaires returned by 1,267 faculty from the 92 institutions during the school year 1975-76. These sources were supplemented by case studies of 14 SCDEs from among the sample of 92 and productivity studies of the population of SCDEs conducted in secondary data sources, i.e., practitioner-oriented journals, practitioner-oriented conferences, and the Resources in Education (RIE) division of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) system.

Data Treatment. Each participating SCDE was classified with regard to:

- The mission or goal emphasis of the SCDE in dissemination and utilization.
- The organizational arrangements made by the SCDE in support of D&U.
- The evidence available that the faculty of the SCDE were involved in activities or processes associated with D&U.
- The products of D&U activity in the SCDE insofar as that could be determined by examining national outlets for such products.

These four assessments led to a summary classification of SCDEs based on their involvement in D&U. In each instance a projection was made from the sample to the population of 671 SCDEs. Details on the rules used at each step in the process are included in the Technical Appendix since they would be disruptive to the reader if they were included in the body of the report.

Institutional Mission: Are SCDEs Committed to D&U?

Three sources of information were available on the SCDEs relevant to the strength of the institutional commitment to dissemination and utilization activities, i.e.:

- A formal document or mission statement for the SCDE.
- The SCDE chief administrator's perception of the emphasis placed upon a variety of D&U activity areas by the SCDE.
- Faculty perceptions of the importance of D&U activity areas to the SCDE mission.

All three information sources were used to classify the SCDEs with regard to their D&U commitment. The following six groups were required to create relatively homogeneous clusters for the 92 SCDEs in the sample:[4]

Group 1 (N=13) - Strong Commitment to D&U - SCDEs expressing nearly unequivocal support for and interest in D&U activities.

Group 2 (N=18) - Positive Support for D&U - High to moderate support for and interest in D&U.

Group 3 (N=15) - Acceptance of D&U Activity - Moderate support for D&U but expressed in such a fashion that it is clearly subordinate to other mission areas of the SCDE.

Group 4 (N=15) - Weak Commitment to D&U - SCDEs in which D&U activity, if it exists, is a result of the individual interest of faculty members and proceeds for the most part without institutional sanction.

Group 5 (N=15) - Little or No Commitment to D&U - These SCDEs avoided mention of, or denied interest in, D&U as a mission area for the SCDE.

Group 6 (N=16) - Ambivalent Commitment to D&U - In these SCDEs the data sources were in obvious disagreement about the institution's commitment to D&U.

---

[4] See Technical Appendix (Note #1) for (a) the actual questions from which the data were generated and (b) the formal rules employed in classifying the SCDEs into the six groups.

A Profile of Commitment by Institutional Type. In Table 1, SCDEs are portrayed in terms of their institutional commitment to D&U by the eight institutional types. There are a few observations worth noting:

- Twenty-eight percent of the sites (188 institutions) assert institutional missions in D&U which would lead one to assume that external interventions in D&U would be congruent with internal interests. Another 133 SCDEs have institutional missions which would be at least complementary to, if not congruent with, such activities.

- The mission analysis leaves no doubt that public SCDEs feel a greater responsibility toward D&U involvement than their private counterparts. No private SCDE was classified as maintaining a "strong commitment" and only 27 of the 188 SCDEs in groups one or two were private counterparts.

- Institutional mission commitment to D&U is dispersed across the institutional categories by degree level. The percentage of institutions in groups 1-3 is nearly identical for all public categories: i.e., A-Public, 57%; B-Publics, 58%; C-Publics, 60%; D-Publics, 62.5%. The same observation can be made for the private categories with the percentages ranging from 29% to 38% with the exception of the A-Privates who tend to eschew D&U missions --17%.

- If institutional mission emphasis is taken seriously as an evidence of either current or potential D&U involvement, this dispersion of interest is very significant because of the large numbers of B-Public and masters level SCDEs. For example, the public masters SCDEs alone include 166 institutions in groups 1-3.

- An interesting aside is the cluster of SCDEs classified as ambivalent. The ambivalence in this group represents a conflict between the stated mission and the administrator's perception of the centrality of D&U activities on the one hand and the faculty's perception on the other. In the case of the A-Publics the RITE project observation that in doctoral institutions generally, and higher prestige institutions in particular, the faculty are unconvinced that factors other than teaching and research are rewarded by the university seems to be confirmed by these data.

TABLE 1

COMMITMENT OF SCDEs TO D&U ACTIVITIES BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE
FOR THE STUDY SAMPLE AND POPULATION

INSTITUTIONAL TYPE	NUMBER OF SCDEs BY MISSION GROUPS*											
	Strong Commitment		Positive Support		Acceptance		Weak Commitment		Little/No Commitment		Ambivalent Commitment	
	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P	S	P
A. Public Research Centers	1	3	2	7	1	3	-	-	-	-	3	10
A. Private Research Centers	-	-	1	2	-	-	2	4	1	2	1	2
B. Other Public Doctoral	2	9	6	28	3	14	3	14	1	5	4	19
B. Other Private Doctoral	-	-	2	8	1	4	2	8	3	11	-	-
C. Public Masters Teacher Centers	8	58	3	22	4	29	2	15	3	22	5	37
C. Private Masters Teachers Centers	-	-	3	17	2	11	2	11	4	22	2	11
D. Other Public** Masters	2	23	1	11	2	23	1	11	1	12	1	12
D. Other Private** Masters	-	-	-	-	2	49	3	73	2	49	-	-
TOTAL	13	93	18	95	15	133	15	136	15	123	16	91

S = Actual number in the sample of 92
p = Projected number in the population of 671

---

* In this and in subsequent tables, rounding to the nearest whole number for purposes of projection to the population may cause a slight variance in the total number of SCDEs noted in each institutional category and/or in the total population.

** The reader should recall that these categories were least adequately sampled (8 of 91 and 7 of 169 respectively) and the possible error in projecting to the population is most likely to occur and most likely to be consequential.

Summary.[5] Based on mission analysis alone, one would answer the question about SCDE commitment to D&U as follows:

- As a total group, doctoral and masters level SCDEs are not committed to D&U activity, i.e., groups 4 and 5 exceed groups 1 and 2 numerically.
- However, significantly large sub-groups of SCDEs are committed to D&U (188 in groups 1 and 2) and probably 321 of the sites would be likely sites for D&U activities and/or programs.
- Degree level and involvement in R&D productivity are poor predictors of mission emphasis in D&U. If one were searching for likely sites for D&U intervention on the basis of stated and perceived missions, masters level SCDEs are as likely sites as doctoral institutions.
- Locus of control is a predictor of mission commitment in D&U. Public SCDEs avow mission emphases in D&U in much larger numbers than their private counterparts.

Organizational Arrangements: Are SCDEs Organized to Carry Out D&U Programs?

Organizational arrangements employed by SCDEs to support D&U missions include:

- Formal structures maintained by the organization, e.g., field service bureaus or institutes, school study councils, etc., and
- Personnel practices and policies designed to reinforce particular activities or productivity on the part of the faculty, e.g., promotion, tenure, and recruitment criteria.[6]

Institutional questionnaire responses and, in many instances, descriptive brochures and pamphlets were available on the formal structures. Evidence on personnel practices and policies included formal statements of criteria

---

[5] In the Exemplar Appendix (Example #1) the reader will find three actual SCDE mission statements which typify the categories of (a) strong commitment, (b) acceptance, and (c) little or no commitment.

[6] Faculty released time for D&U would be another powerful indicator of commitment on the part of the SCDE but the data available from the RITE report did not distinguish between released time for R&D activity and D&U activity.

used in promotion and tenure decisions, the SCDE chief administrator's perception of the emphasis placed on D&U in recruitment, promotion, and tenure, and perceptions held by faculty of the importance of D&U in promotion and tenure decisions.

Formal Institutional Structures. In crediting institutional structures to SCDEs, conservative decisions were made to insure that the resultant data would represent credible local agency efforts in support of D&U, to wit:

- Many SCDEs maintain laboratory or demonstration schools - nearly 100 in all. These structures were eliminated from consideration since it was impossible to distinguish between those maintained solely for teacher education functions and those with D&U objectives. There were some of the latter type which should have been included.

- Institutional structures which may have been significant but did not obviously require institutional effort and budget to support or were not unambiguously tied to D&U were dropped, e.g., faculty committees, in-house journals, inter-departmental arrangements, etc. Structures which were retained included field service bureaus, leagues of schools, school study councils, teacher centers or in-service instructional support units, and other designated formal units involving the SCDE explicitly in D&U.[7]

Using these recording rules for the data, and projecting to the population in the same manner as was employed in the preceding section, 372 SCDEs maintained at least one formal structure in support of D&U and the population of SCDEs maintained 551 such units. Table 2 displays these data by institutional type. There are a number of observations worth noting:

- Overall one must be impressed with the sheer number of D&U units being operated by SCDEs. There are program units in the field on which to build in national planning for D&U and these units

---

[7] Examples #2 and #3 in the Exemplar Appendix include (a) illustrative descriptions of a field service bureau and school study council and (b) a list and two illustrative descriptions of the various other D&U structures maintained by SCDEs. Technical Note #2 contains the questionnaire items from which the data were generated and the rules employed in grouping the institutions on the basis of formal institutional structures.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF SCDEs MAINTAINING AT LEAST ONE FORMAL ORGANIZATIONAL D&U UNIT AND THE TOTAL NUMBER OF SUCH UNITS BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPES

INSTITUTIONAL TYPE	NUMBER OF SCDEs		
	Percent Maintaining At Least One Unit	Number Maintaining At Least One Unit	Total Number Of Units
A - Publics	100	23	30
A- Privates	80	9	29
B - Publics	78	69	151
B - Privates	38	11	26
C - Publics	64	117	154
C - Privates	46	35	53
D - Publics	38	35	35
D - Privates	43	73	73
TOTAL		372	551

involve resources of magnitude in terms of personnel and money. Interestingly, few of these structures appeared to be outgrowths of federal support dollars.

- Institutional types are related to the maintenance of D&U strutures. A-Publics and Privates, B-Publics, and C-Publics typically maintain such units. In the remaining four institutional types they are found much less frequently.

- Despite the demur recorded by the A-Privates at the mission level, they are obviously involved in D&U.

- Even though the percentage of C-Publics maintaining a D&U unit is smaller, the number of units found in such sites is large. Because of the large number of B- and C-Public SCDEs, they jointly operate over half of all such units.

Personnel Policies in Support of D&U. An operational test of an institution's commitment to a mission or goal area can be made by assessing the extent to which the reward system is used to reinforce employee behavior in the goal area. An examination of the importance of D&U is SCDE faculty evaluations highlights SCDEs currently involved in, and supportive of D&U, and the extent to which committed SCDEs emphasize D&U mission activities. These data, additionally, have special relevance to rational planning efforts about D&U, since the power of the external interventions required to modify this contextual feature of an institution would be beyond the scope of impact of most external change agencies. Personnel evaluation policies and practices are less susceptible to change through external intervention than, for example, structural adjustments in the organization which might be required to initiate a bureau or center to attract funding for D&U activities. SCDE personnel practices are nested in the reward system of the university as a whole and reflect, generally, the status hierarchy of the institution.

The assignment of SCDEs to homogeneous groups on the basis of the use of D&U activity and productivity in the evaluation of faculty for recruitment, promotion, and tenure needs to be placed in context. No school of education

contended that D&U was preeminent in its reward system, i.e., that it was more important than teaching and/or research and scholarship in faculty evaluation. In some doctoral level institutions, research is viewed as preeminent. In many institutions, success in teaching is preeminent. D&U activity is viewed as helpful to essential in many institutional settings, but even in the group which is rated as "high" in the classification system which will be employed, a faculty member would be unlikely to survive on the basis of excellence in this area alone.

Under such circumstances one would expect that it would be difficult to form extreme groups in the sample and that, in fact, turned out to be the case. Somewhat to the surprise of the investigators, however, it was more difficult to identify SCDEs disavowing the use of D&U in faculty evaluation than asserting consistently that D&U activities are helpful to essential to faculty being evaluated. Only 13 SCDEs fell in the former group; 24 were in the latter. The specific rules governing the classification are included in the Technical Appendix[8] but, in general, the highly supportive group offered evidence that D&U was used by the SCDE in faculty evaluation consistently across data sources, i.e., the formal statement of promotion and tenure criteria and administrator and faculty perceptions of criteria employed. Conversely, the low group denied the importance of D&U with inter-source consistency. The middle grouping exhibited some evidence of use of such criteria. Table 3 depicts the categorization of the sampled SCDEs projected to the population of SCDEs under study. Several observations are noteworthy:

- Concern that the reward system of SCDEs is wholly inimical to D&U activity is unwarranted. In only 87 SCDEs did it appear

[8] See Technical Appendix, Note #3.

TABLE 3

IMPORTANCE OF D&U FOR FACULTY EVALUATION IN SCDEs
BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

INSTITUTIONAL TYPE	NUMBER OF SCDEs		
	Consistently Noted As Of Importance	Noted As Used For Evaluation	Consistently Noted As Of Little Importance
A - Publics	3	17	3
A- Privates	4	3	4
B - Publics	19	66	4
B - Privates	-	26	4
C - Publics	44	102	37
C - Privates	29	35	11
D - Publics	46	45	-
D - Privates	49	96	24
TOTAL	194	390	87

that faculty involvement in D&U would be in conflict with the formal system.

- Masters level institutions have the least difficulty in incorporating D&U in the reward system; this undoubtedly occurs because they place less emphasis on R&D in their evaluations.
- As was noted earlier in the discussion of institutional structures, the A-Public and Private SCDEs look more similar at the level of organizational arrangements than they did at the level of mission statements.

Summary Grouping by Organizational Arrangements. In assessing the organizational arrangements in SCDEs in support of D&U, the two preceding groupings of SCDEs are both taken into account resulting in the groupings displayed in Table 4. The rules employed for this step are enumerated in the Technical Appendix.[9] The intent of the rules was to form clusters of SCDEs about which there would be little doubt in terms of their organizational commitment to D&U. The rules were skewed against including SCDEs in the upper groups as can be noted form the distribution in Table 4 in contrast with Tables 2 and 3. Only about 13 percent of the SCDEs were placed in the lowest grouping on the use of the reward system in support of D&U but approximately 30 percent are classified in the lowest group on the combined measures. This reflects a conscious effort to search for some concrete evidence of commitment to D&U which would expend institutional resources to support before judging that an SCDE is supporting D&U through organizational arrangements. No SCDE, for example, could be placed in the highest group without maintaining at least two identifiable formal structures in support of D&U.

Although Table 4 presents no surprises after examining Tables 2 and 3, it does present an appropriate occasion to reflect individually on the institutional types:

---

[9] See Technical Appendix, Note #4.

TABLE 4

LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR D&U THROUGH ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS IN SCDEs BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

INSTITUTIONAL TYPE	NUMBER OF SCDEs		
	Highly Supportive Organizational Arrangements	Moderately Supportive Organizational Arrangements	Little Support Through Organizational Arrangements
A - Publics	20	3	-
A - Privates	4	2	4
B - Publics	52	19	19
B - Privates	8	4	19
C - Publics	59	81	44
C - Privates	6	40	29
D - Publics	12	57	23
D - Privates	49	49	73
TOTAL	210	255	211

- A-Public SCDEs seem evidently to be involved in D&U activity. A small number presented ambiguous evidence in regard to mission and negative evidence on the reward system but all maintained operating D&U units. D&U is in competition with R&D in these institutions and is obviously running a good race.

- A-Privates SCDEs are not consistent across measures in their response to D&U. A third are highly supportive in terms of organizational arrangements despite their disavowal of support in their mission statement. A third are clear in their institutional stance eschewing such activity.

- B-Publics are strong sites for D&U activity. The non-involved B-Public SCDE would clearly be in the minority, about 20 percent.

- B-Privates as a group are consistently weak sites for D&U. Their organizational arrangements are consistent with their mission statements.

- C-Publics are relatively involved D&U sites and, considering their total number, represent an institutional resource pool of considerable significance.

- The potential of the C-Privates is over-estimated by either of the individual measures of organizational arrangements. This is due to the inconstancy of their involvement, i.e., even the minority reporting structures did not support the structures with the reward system. Conversely, a number noting that faculty were rewarded for such activity did not maintain formal structures.

- The D-Publics and Privates were both represented in the population by small samples and the results are, consequently, presented with less confidence. Both categories appear to fall well below the level of commitment of the C-Publics and that is probably the most cogent point to be made, i.e., in considering the potential for D&U activity among masters level SCDEs, the sub-group of 183 C-Publics is the more likely involved group than the total of 518 masters level SCDEs.

The answer to the question with which this section began is "yes" and "no." About a third of the SCDEs seem to have highly supportive arrangements; an almost equal number do not. There surely is organizational capacity and resources for D&U in SCDEs which should be utilized in national planning for D&U in education.

Process Measures: Are SCDE Faculty Engaged in D&U Activities?

Evidence on faculty involvement in D&U activities was available from self-reports by faculty on their involvement in four types of activities: 1) publishing in practitioner-oriented journals; 2) serving in an editorial capacity on such journals; 3) making presentations at practitioner-oriented conferences; and 4) rendering ad hoc services to schools. SCDE deans or chairpersons also reported on the frequency of local education agency (LEA) requests for service from the SCDE.[10] These are far from perfect data on which to base the answer to the question posed in this section, but there were some interesting general patterns worth reporting:

- If education faculty are isolated from the schools, they are inveterate liars. Nearly all faculty in A, B, and D-Public SCDEs (95-100%) reported involvement in school service projects. Even institutional types with less involvement reported that about 80% worked on ad hoc service activities with schools. Only in the D-Privates were a minority of faculty (38%) involved with these activities.

- The other process measures for faculty were size-related. Faculty in larger and more prestigeful SCDEs tended to be more involved in publications and conference activity.

- The most interesting difference reported by the deans in relation to requests for service from LEAs is the expected difference between public and private SCDEs. The fewest requests were reported by deans in C, A, and D-Private SCDEs. Most frequent requests were reported in B, D, and A-Public schools of education.

Despite the paucity of data available on how the faculty actually use their time in D&U activity, it was possible to distinguish sharply among SCDEs on the basis of the data available. The institutions were divided

---

[10] See Technical Appendix, Note #5.

into four groups based on the extent of faculty involvement in the D&U activities surveyed and the requests from LEAs to the SCDE for service.[11] The groups can be fairly typified as follows:

Group 1 (N=22) Most faculty involved in D&U (plus 50%).
Group 2 (N=25) Many faculty involved (circa 50%).
Group 3 (N=22) Some faculty involved (less than 50%).
Group 4 (N=17) Few faculty involved (25% or less).

Table 5 depicts the classification of SCDEs on this basis by institutional types. Several comments seem appropriate:

- The A and B-Public SCDEs affirmed their earlier noted involvement in D&U.
- B-Private SCDEs scored higher as a group than would have been predicted from the earlier measures due to the high percentage of faculty reporting ad hoc service involvements with schools. This is consistent with a widely held belief that faculty in such SCDEs are engaged in private consulting relationships with LEAs and would explain the apparent anomaly, i.e., the institutional commitment to D&U activity is low but individual involvement is high.
- Faculty in C-Public SCDEs reported less involvement than might have been predicted from prior measures. This may reflect an over-emphasis in the process measures on publications and presentations at conferences tending to favor the doctoral level SCDEs.

Summary. SCDE faculty generally do use some portion of their time in D&U activities. Their involvement in ad hoc service relationships with schools may be a mixed blessing for anyone interested in supporting their involvement on an institutional basis in D&U since much of this activity currently appears to be conducted on a private consultative basis. On the other hand, the simple fact of their involvement is a positive feature in linking the knowledge base with the practitioner. These data suggest that the impact of SCDEs and faculty on knowledge utilization in education has been underestimated.

---

[11] See Technical Appendix, Note #5.

TABLE 5

LEVEL OF SCDE FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN D&U BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

INSTITUTIONAL TYPE	NUMBER OF SCDEs/LEVEL OF FACULTY INVOLVEMENT			
	Most	Many	Some	Few
A - Publics	16	7	-	-
A - Privates	2	-	9	-
B - Publics	36	42	11	-
B - Privates	9	13	9	-
C - Publics	24	60	38	61
C - Privates	13	6	19	38
D - Publics	12	34	34	12
D - Privates	29	-	85	56
TOTAL	141	162	205	167

The key SCDEs to isolate are those in which individual involvement is complemented by institutional commitment and support.

Productivity Measures: Are SCDEs Producing in D&U?

The data available in this study are necessary but insufficient measures of SCDE productivity in D&U. Drawn from the RITE study data they include the number of 1) articles in 13 practitioner-oriented journals; 2) practitioner-oriented presentations at six national conferences; and 3) contributions to the RIE portion of the ERIC system which were judged to be directed toward the community of practice rather than the research community.[12]

The authors contend that such measures are directly relevant to D&U productivity but insufficient since they miss many D&U products altogether. One would wish, for example, to be able to observe and record the results of direct interactions with practitioners in the processes of increasing awareness of alternatives, assisting in trials of new approaches and products, servicing and supporting the adaptation, adoption, and institutionalization of innovations by teachers and LEAs. And, under the best circumstances, one would hope to have some qualitative as well as quantitative measures.

This insufficiency is aggravated by the suspicion that the measures include a systematic bias in favor of doctoral level SCDEs with R&D commitments. The journals and conferences surveyed were national in scope and hence, more congruent with the mission scope of the larger, more prestigious doctoral level institutions. Additionally, the reward systems in such SCDEs are more likely to emphasize publications for promotions and tenure. Such

---

[12] The basis for the selection of these data sources is included in the Technical Appendix, Note #6.

measures, even when focused on D&U rather than R&D, are skewed toward the interests of SCDEs in which the sphere of influence is national rather than regional, state or local and in which faculty are attuned to scholarly productivity.

Sufficient data, however, are simply not available to assess SCDE productivity in D&U. What then are the likely consequences of operating with insufficient data? The authors would guess that the consequences are threefold:

1. A systematic over-estimation of productivity in doctoral level SCDEs, especially research center SCDEs.

2. A systematic under-estimation of productivity in masters level SCDEs.

3. A realistic possibility that a number of SCDEs with state or regional constituencies in D&U will be overlooked altogether although they are productive in D&U.

The consequences of the over-estimation are probably not important. Most of the identified producers would also be involved in other forms of productivity. The same argument can hardly be made for those SCDEs which are under-assessed. But there is a safeguard in both instances. In the next subsection of the paper, the SCDEs are regrouped on the basis of all four measures which have been employed, i.e., mission, organizational arrangements, processes, and products. This regrouping lends assurance that the final classification is more credible than any single measure would have been. An SCDE scoring in the high group on all four measures is undoubtedly committed institutionally to D&U. After the accumulation of the data across the four measures, it is unlikely that an SCDE with four low scores has been overlooked as a D&U center. This assurance does not, however, eliminate the problem of over- and under-estimation when some measures, which are eventually summed, possess biases. But it does provide a safeguard against gross errors in

classification unless all the component measures share the identical direction of bias. In this case, they do not.

Productivity by Institutional Groups. With their deficiencies, or perhaps because of them, these productivity measures distinguished sharply among the population of SCDEs. The median SCDE in the highest quartile of the population, for example, accumulated 10.5 publication credits in practitioner-oriented journals. three RIE credits, and four convention presentation credits. In contrast, none of the institutions in the lowest quartile (actually the bottom 22 SCDEs) accumulated credits on any of the measures, i.e., over the two to three years surveyed no member of these SCDE faculties published an article in the 13 journals, made a presentation at one of the six conferences, or had a document accepted by ERIC for inclusion in RIE. With the fortuitous formation of the "natural quartile" of non-producers, the remaining SCDEs were simply divided into quartiles by the sum of their ranks on the individual productivity measures and are displayed in these groups in Table 6.

Several observations about Table 6 are in order:

- The inflation for research center SCDEs occurred as predicted. Even without institutional commitments to D&U, researchers from these SCDEs are obviously extended invitations to publish in practitioner journals and to speak at practitioner conferences. Their ideas are a part of the currency exchange in the practitioner market-place.

- This phenomenon is less clear in the B-type SCDEs. Although they are slightly higher on the product measures than on some of the prior measures employed, their relative institutional rank is not changed, i.e., obviously the B-Publics are more involved in D&U than the Privates and a significant number of both groups are low producers.

- The toll which these measures assess on the masters level SCDEs is substantial. However, a large number still fall in the high and middle range producer categories, about 115.

Summary. Considering the limitations of the productivity data, it is probably not worthwhile to labor over the differences among institutional

TABLE 6

LEVEL OF SCDE PRODUCTIVITY IN D&U BY INSTITUTIONAL TYPE

INSTITUTIONAL TYPE	NUMBER OF SCDEs			
	High Producers	Middle Range Producers	Low Producers	Non-Producers
A - Publics	23	-	-	-
A - Privates	9	-	2	-
B - Publics	47	33	10	-
B - Privates	-	19	11	-
C - Publics	15	66	44	59
C - Privates	-	11	17	47
D - Publics	-	23	46	23
D - Privates	-	-	73	96
TOTAL	94	152	203	225

categories. However, one can note that faculty in approximately 250 SCDEs are significant producers of D&U artifacts being distributed to practitioners and are conduits for the distribution of this material.

A Typology of SCDE Involvement in Dissemination and Utilization

The simplest way to categorize SCDE involvement in D&U was to sum the responses of the SCDEs on the four measures.[13] Using this approach, two pure groups constituting roughly a fourth of the sample emerged, i.e.:

1. 15 SCDEs were recorded positively on all four measures. These institutions were designated as "D&U Centers."

2. 7 SCDEs were recorded negatively on all measures. These institutions were argued to be "Not Involved."

The large mid-group could have been sorted out by the numerical strength of their response, i.e., 3-1, 2-2, 1-3. To do that, however, would assume no distinction among the items of evidence available on SCDE involvement in D&U and the authors believed there was at least one which should be distinguished. Maintenance of a formal organizational structure in support of D&U requires an institutional budgetary commitment to D&U which could be affirmed reliably by the available data. Consequently, the sort was continued on the basis of the number of positive responses except that SCDEs without such units which have been placed in the next-to-highest group were dropped one classification and those with such units in the next-to-lowest group were raised a classification. The result of this manipulation was:

3. The identification of 21 SCDEs in the sample which were recorded positively on three of the four measures and which maintained an operating D&U center. These SCDEs were designated as "Potential D&U Centers".

---

[13] Rules for classifying institutional responses at each level as either negative or positive are contained in the Technical Appendix, Note #7.

4. Fifteen SCDEs without operating D&U Centers which were recorded negatively on three of the four measures - "Minimally Involved SCDEs."

5. Thirty SCDEs which were involved to some extent in D&U but in which the commitment was at least inconstant. This was the most heterogeneous of the groups and was probably best typified as "Sometimes Involved."

The effect of this classification projected to the population of SCDEs is portrayed in Table 7.

Summary. Without repeating observations made earlier it is probably sufficient at this time to remark that despite sub-group variations at different levels the summary classification clearly indicates involvement in D&U in areas in which it was expected to occur, i.e., the flow of figures is from the upper left of the table to the lower right. The largest number of involved SCDEs appear to occur in the A-, B-, and C-Public categories.

TABLE 7

CLASSIFICATION OF SCDEs BY INVOLVEMENT IN D&U FOR INSTITUTIONAL TYPES

INSTITUTIONAL TYPE	NUMBER OF SCDEs				
	D&U Centers	Potential D&U Centers	Sometimes Involved	Minimally Involved	Not Involved
A - Publics	16	7	-	-	-
A - Privates	2	-	7	2	-
B - Publics	28	33	28	-	-
B - Privates	4	8	8	11	-
C - Publics	29	59	66	15	15
C - Privates	11	-	29	11	23
D - Publics	-	23	46	23	-
D - Privates	-	-	24	96	49
TOTAL	90	130	208	158	87

[14] Brief composite case examples of SCDEs classified in these categories are included in The Exemplary Appendix (examples 4, 5, and 6). These cases are illustrative of the category and do not represent single institutions.

II. SETTING THE STAGE: LIKELY FEDERAL INTERVENTION STRATEGIES AND CRITICAL DESCRIPTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF SCDEs

The response of SCDEs, collectively or individually, to federal intervention strategies in dissemination and utilization will be determined by the interaction of four sets of variables:

1. The characteristics of the intervention.
2. The current involvement of the SCDE(s) in D&U.
3. Contextual characteristics of the SCDE(s).
4. External impact factors other than the intervention which are impacting upon SCDE(s).

In this section four federal programs of support for educational D&U are selected for analysis which are operative or are being discussed as likely new programs. A salient characteristic of all these programs is that they have been designed with little attention to the role in educational D&U which might be played by schools of education. Employing the normative data from Section I, and considering internal and external impact factors affecting the near future of SCDEs, the authors assess the most likely responses to, and effects of, such programs if they were re-designed on the assumption that SCDEs could be involved as productive agencies in support of educational D&U.

Four Federal Intervention Strategies in D&U

The four intervention strategies to be discussed are: 1) training for D&U roles: 2) capacity building grants in D&U; 3) organizational networks for D&U; and 4) the establishment of a comprehensive dissemination system. These generic types obviously do not represent the universe of strategies and each

is susceptible to a myriad of tactical variations. The particular four were selected because they are either in use with agencies other than SCDEs as targets, i.e., capacity building grants and networks; are employed commonly by the federal government in areas of concern, i.e., training program grants; or seem to be a logical extension of the current federal interest, i.e., the comprehensive strategy. The brief descriptions which follow are designed to identify the major characteristics of each strategy and minimize attention to the possible tactical variations which might be employed with the strategy. The authors' purpose is to reduce and simplify the characteristics of such interventions to a point where they can be used for analytic purposes.

Training Programs. The purpose of such an intervention strategy is to improve and expand activity in a field by increasing the number of trained personnel in that field. According to the Dissemination Analysis Group (DAG) report, "Any major effort to improve educational dissemination will require special provisions for training and upgrading personnel. No system can function without people who are cognizant of the requirements of the system and trained to provide the services necessary for its functioning. Yet little is found in either the pre-service or in-service training of teachers to enable them to be better users, and the number of training or academic programs with a major concentration on dissemination are few."[15]

Many analog programs which have been used by the federal government could be cited but the R&D Training Program established under Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is sufficient for the purpose. That program

---

[15] Jerry Fletcher, et al., Dissemination in Relation to Elementary and Secondary Education (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Washington, DC), Final Report of the Dissemination Analysis Group to the Dissemination Policy Council, January, 1977, pp. 21-22.

provided instructional and individual support for undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral training programs, short term institutes and special training projects, and program development grants. The trainees ranged from degree-bound doctoral students who were envisioned as independent investigators to individuals developing technical skills who might be employed as an assistant on a project staff. The assumption will be made that an equally comprehensive training program would be initiated for D&U personnel in education.

Capacity Building Grants. A capacity building intervention strategy is designed to establish, increase, or improve institutional capacity to perform in a specified function area. The goal of the program is to institutionalize the new, expanded, or modified capacity during a period of support after which continued external financial assistance would become unnecessary or at least less necessary. Such interventions assume that the target organizations are interested in building and sustaining such capacity, i.e., the capacity is complementary to, if not congruent with, organizational goals and resources.

The National Institute of Education (NIE) program of capacity building grants in D&U to state education agencies (SEAs) is illustrative of this intervention strategy. By designing the request for proposals to require three distinct components --1) a comprehensive set of information resources; 2) the means of linking client groups to the resource base; and 3) the leadership to provide for maintenance and enhancement of dissemination services --a specific kind of D&U capacity, appropriate to SEAs, was established. The assumption will be made that a similar strategy could be employed to affect extant or projected D&U capacity in SCDEs.

Organizational Networks. An organizational network intervention is the creation or support of linkages among operating agencies to foster a mutual function of the agencies. In the case of D&U the involved agencies normally

include disseminators and users of knowledge and the shared function is two-way communication about, or support of, the installation and institutionalization of knowledge-based alternative practices in schools.

Three current federal D&U programs in education are appropriate analogs for this strategy: the National Diffusion Network (NDN); the Research and Development Utilization Program (RDU); and the Research and Development Exchange Program (RDx). These programs differ in focus and scope but are similar in their reliance on interagency linkages, both natural and synthetic, to facilitate local problem-solving.

Two kinds of networking interventions involving SCDEs could be initiated. First, although SCDEs are currently not participating in any federally-sponsored networking arrangements, they are involved with and maintain network relationships, e.g., school study councils, IGE League arrangements, teacher resource centers. One intervention strategy would be to build upon, modify, or improve these extant networks in which the SCDE is the keystone agency. Alternatively, one might create a role for SCDEs within the networks already being supported by the federal government under NDN, RDU, or RDx.

Comprehensive Dissemination System. The creating of a national dissemination system or program in which a variety of agents and agencies participate in D&U activities at state, regional, and national levels was proposed in the Dissemination Analysis Group report of January 1977.[16] Congress has expressed an interest in having NIE study the feasibility of a nationwide system of educational "extension agents" modeled after the Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture. A comprehensive system would be just that, a federally sponsored effort to create a set of interlocking relationships between the researcher

---

[16] Ibid.

and the practitioner in education organized on a national scale. The purpose of such a program, of course, is to insure that the practitioner has access to and uses the contemporary knowledge base in solving operating problems and improving practice.

The common analog used to describe a comprehensive dissemination program in education is the Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture. Operating through a federal mandate to the States, the Cooperative Extension Service consists of a diverse set of services, developed in response to the local needs and resources of a particular states. Five key characteristics of the Cooperative Extension Service in Agriculture are pertinent to a nationwide dissemination system in education: 1) a research capability (located in a public university); 2) highly visible field agents working with and for local schools; 3) state and local autonomy within a national framework; 4) cooperative funding from federal, state, and local governments; and 5) an apolitical and non-regulatory function.

For the purposes of this paper, the authors will assume that the federal government will not: 1) attempt to model the Cooperative Extension Service directly, or 2) attempt to create a de novo centralized structure which emphasizes classic system definitions of input, output, and control; or 3) simply be satisfied to enrich and expand existing D&U mechanisms in the hope that they will become a more effective national system. Our assumption is that such a system will: 1) emphasize inter-agency networking arrangements; 2) vary in the configuration and role of involved agencies from state-to-state;[17]

[17] We realize and expect that in some sections of the country inter-state linkages and configurations will be more important than intra-state, e.g., the Northeast.

3) provide for personal linking agents working between the communities of knowledge and practice; and 4) protect the autonomy of participating educational agencies. Under such a program SCDEs could be imagined to play various institutional roles, separately and in conjunction with other agencies, and be involved in supplying and/or housing linking agents.

Current Involvement of SCDEs in D&U

The first section of this paper was devoted to a comprehensive normative portrayal of SCDE involvement in D&U. It is appropriate now to summarize the data presented in that section in the form of several generalizations which the authors purport are already "known" about SCDE activity in D&U, this simultaneously reducing the information to a more manageable amount and relating it to the section to come.

1. There are extant D&U resources and capacity in schools of education. These resources assume three forms, each of which is significant for national planning for expanded or improved D&U:

a. Institutional Capacity - even adopting a relatively conservative posture for classification, over 200 SCDEs are committed to D&U missions, operate institutionally sponsored D&U programs, reward their personnel for D&U involvement, and produce D&U artifacts.

b. Center and Bureau Capacity - specialized sub-units for D&U purposes (e.g., centers, bureaus, school study councils) are maintained by over half the masters and doctoral level SCDEs and about 500-600 such units are operating in conjunction with teacher education institutions.

c. Individual Capacity - there are over 30,000[18] faculty members working in the masters and doctoral level SCDEs in the United States.

[18] Clark and Guba, op. cit., p. III - 17.

The overwhelming majority of these faculty are engaged currently in ad hoc service arrangements with schools. The number of faculty engaged in D&U activity far exceeds those involved in R&D and transcends the sites in which institutional involvement can be substantiated.

2. Whatever perspective is brought to bear on SCDE involvement in D&U, efforts to work with and improve schools is a phenomenon characteristic of public rather than private SCDEs. This is not to argue that individual private SCDEs have no investment or interest in D&U, but to note that involvement in dissemination and utilization is congruent with the institutional missions and commitments of much larger numbers of public institutions operating SCDEs.

3. Doctoral public SCDEs are almost all involved in D&U programs. However, an almost equal number (about 100) public masters schools of education are invested currently in this field. In contrast with their low involvement in R&D activity, the masters public SCDE is a rich resource of talent and institutional support in educational D&U.

4. If SCDEs are not involved in the development of a national program of D&U for education, the consequence for a large percentage of schools of education will be a mission and program change as dramatic as if they were cut off from their traditional institutional roles in personnel preparation or educational R&D. The conception of schools of education as agencies cut off from practice and practitioners is a myth.

Contextual Factors Influencing Schools of Education

The RITE study referenced earlier generated an inventory of characteristics of schools of education which were labeled "contextual conditions" and were defined as organizational elements, policies, and practices which have

become well-established hallmarks of such institutions over a long time period, for example, the reward system. Such factors and conditions were argued as affecting frequently the responses of SCDEs to external impact factors.

That inventory of contextual factors[19] was culled to generate a shorter list of those most likely to affect decisions made by SCDEs about their involvement in D&U.[20] Table 8 illustrates some of these contextual factors and their likely impact on SCDE involvement in D&U. A few seem to predispose the SCDE to generally positive responses to external interventions in D&U; some would have varying effects depending upon the characteristics of the intervention; and some would be generally negative in effect. The reader should be alert to the over-simplification imposed by space constraints. As illustrated in Table 8, the conditions do not operate uniformly across sub-groups of SCDEs, e.g., the preeminence of research and scholarly productivity in the reward system is a significant negative factor in A-Public and Private SCDEs but of much less concern in masters level SCDEs. For the purpose of the discussion in this section, the authors have attempted a further simplification by posing a set of generalizations in regard to the impact of these contextual factors on the likely involvement of SCDEs in D&U programs, to wit:

1. Despite observations to the contrary, SCDEs have exhibited vulnerability to external impact factors and pressures for change, e.g., the response of urban-based SCDEs to re-shape their training and service programs around urban themes. Schools of education have traditionally adopted and adjusted missions often with too little attention to the trade-offs involved

---

[19] Clark and Guba, op. cit., pp. VII - 12-33.

[20] Technical Appendix, Note #8.

TABLE 8

SELECTED CONTEXTUAL FACTORS

LIKELY TO AFFECT SCDE INVOLVEMENT IN D&U

DIRECTION OF IMPACT		
Likely Positive Effect	Variable Effect Depending Upon Intervention	Likely Negative Effect
• Ease and frequency with which SCDEs adopt new missions. • Released time to support faculty for participation in non-teaching activities. • SCDE vulnerability to externally initiated pressures for change. • Land grant concept of service, especially in public SCDEs.	• Tradition of individual, ad hoc consulting service by faculty reimbursed by LEAs. • Idiographic culture of SCDEs.* • Pre- and post-employment training and socialization in D&U.	• Emphasis on R&D in faculty reward systems. • Low status of D&U as an activity area.* • Labor intensive character of SCDE budgets. • Instructional headcount budgeting. • Poor record of institutionalization of externally motivated.

* These factors are less powerful in masters level SCDEs.

in embracing new missions and directions. Mission over-reach is a more significant problem for SCDEs than rigid or constrained missions.

2. SCDE budgets are tied more tightly to their line function of teaching than most observers have noted. However, among competing educational agencies they have more flexiblity in responding to new programs than, for example, LEAs or SEAs because of their tradition of released time to faculty for nonteaching activities.

3. The status of faculty activities and the SCDE reward system, especially in doctoral institutions, is weighted toward research and scholarly productivity.

4. SCDEs can only be understood if their idiographic culture is understood. Faculty can and do succeed manifesting little responsiveness to institutional goals. This freedom of individual choice on the part of SCDE personnel increases flexibility in response but impedes institutional commitment to goal and activity areas.

External Impact Factors Affecting Schools of Education

The fourth set of variables which needs to be considered in predicting SCDE responses to D&U are those forces outside the school of education, and for the most part beyond its control, which affect the life of the SCDE. Again, a comprehensive list of external impact factors identified in the RITE study[21] was used to generate a more targeted set of factors which seemed to have the most direct implications for SCDE involvement in D&U programs.[22] Table 9 illustrates some of these factors and their likely positive or negative

[21] Clark and Guba, op. cit., pp. VIII - 1-7.

[22] Technical Appendix, Note #9.

TABLE 9

SELECTED EXTERNAL IMPACT FACTORS

LIKELY TO AFFECT SCDE INVOLVEMENT IN D&U

DIRECTION OF IMPACT		
Likely Positive Effect	Variable Effect Depending Upon Intervention	Likely Negative Effect
• Increase in demand from the field for personnel trained in D&U.	• Perceptions of effectiveness of past involvement of SCDEs in D&U programs.	• Dissatisfaction with SCDE training program efforts by teachers.
• Increased interest by policy makers and decision makers in linking the knowledge base with practice.	• Interest in participatory involvement in D&U by teacher groups, LEAs, and SEAs.	• Waning influence of SCDEs with policy makers and decision makers.
• Decreasing student enrollments and higher education budgets.	• Emergence of competitive agencies in educational research, training, and service functions.	

effects on SCDE responses to federal interventions in D&U. The following generalizations about the external factors seem especially appropriate to the predictions which will follow:

1. SCDEs are in, and will continue to experience, a "recession" in numbers of students, faculty, and fiscal resources. This will create an environment of responsiveness to external interventions which have any tendency to offset the recession. More pointedly, SCDEs will be relatively easy targets for external change agents interested in expanding or improving D&U programs.

2. Schools of education are an "old line" agency in education receiving more than their share of criticism for past and current performance in conventional function areas. In contrast with de novo agencies SCDEs have already proven their inability to perform miracles. D&U, if not a new function area, is being conceived of in new ways and is receiving renewed and expanded attention. Directing emphasis toward SCDEs as a major D&U agency is likely to be met with skepticism by necessary reference groups, i.e., legislators, administrators, and teachers -- individually and through the organized teaching profession.

3. SEAs, LEAs, and the organized teaching profession have been engaged in a struggle to wrest what many of them would consider undue power, emphasis, and concentration of federal funds from SCDEs. They may be reluctant to support D&U programs over-emphasizing this agency.

4. Newer definitions and concepts of D&U will require responses beyond the extant D&U programs of SCDEs, e.g., field service bureau, ad hoc service, school study councils. Organizations in recession have special difficulties in responding to needed qualitative changes in, or expansions of, their services. Their basic posture tends to be one of conservatism and maintenance responses rather than change and improvement.

III. LIKELY RESPONSES BY SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION TO FEDERAL INFORMATION STRATEGIES IN EDUCATIONAL KNOWLEDGE DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION

In this section of the paper, each of the four federal intervention strategies in D&U will be re-examined. An attempt will be made to employ the normative data and the contextual and external impact factors to predict how schools of education would respond to such interventions if these strategies were used by the federal government and SCDEs were encouraged to participate in the programs. For each intervention, the predictions will be made in general for SCDEs as an agency class, then note will be taken of sub-group differences within SCDEs.

Predicted Responses to Training Program Strategy

A. General Predictions

1. SCDE enthusiasm for and response to training grants in D&U would undoubtedly be high. This strategy is congruent with the primary function area of SCDE (teaching training and education) and overlaps their continuing interest in service to schools.

2. The initial response from SCDEs to training programs in D&U would undoubtedly be dominated by degree-bound, conservative graduate programs to train research personnel in D&U. This is what they know how to do best and are able to do with existing (or slightly modified) courses and resources. A similar phenomenon was noted in response to ESEA, Title IV. An investigation of that program after two years of its operation concluded that, "Qualitatively, the programs look like traditional programs with a heavy emphasis on the methods of experimental psychology."[23]

[23] David L. Clark and John E. Hopkins, A Report on Educational Research, Development, and Diffusion Manpower, 1964-1974 (Indiana University Research Foundation: Bloomington, IN), 1969, p. 560.

3. If an effort is made to emphasize new roles in D&U in soliciting training proposals, SCDEs will react with confusion since the training requirements for the new roles (as well as the role definitions themselves) are hazy to non-existent. To protect the perceived quality of their training proposals, they are more likely to fall back on adaptations of what they know how to do, rather than attempting to invent new programs.

4. Unless the grants include funds for program development and faculty and student support, SCDE responses will be crippled. Their current budgetary and personnel constraints make it difficult to initiate "loser" programs, i.e., training programs in which tuition reimbursement does not offset costs, or to invest heavily in program development activities. A program emphasizing student support alone would exacerbate the tendency toward conservative responses and minor adaptations of existing programs.

5. Perceptions by SEAs and LEAs of SCDEs and their faculty as divorced from the world of the practitioner will make it difficult to attract students to D&U training programs and to establish field experience linkages for students with non-SCDE agencies.

6. If the proposed training program insists on parity relationships among agencies for training purposes, SCDEs will have difficulty adjusting to and maintaining such relationships. SCDE faculty perceive themselves as "first among equals" in educational personnel training.

7. SCDE faculty requiring retraining or contemporary experience in D&U to be effective participants in D&U training will be reluctant to participate in such inservice training unless it is legitimated as a part of the training grants. Inservice education for university faculty is not an accepted part of socialization to the professorship.

B. Sub-Group Variations

1. Based on the contextual features of such SCDEs, and on the experience of the Title IV ESEA research training programs,[24] doctoral-level SCDEs (especially the A-Publics and Privates) will respond most enthusiastically to grants for high prestige educational programs, i.e., post-doctoral programs or academic year support for students enrolled in doctoral programs. Their highest level of interest will be in preparing personnel for research, evaluation, planning, and technical assistance roles in D&U systems.

2. Master's-level and less research-oriented doctoral SCDEs will be more interested in competing for short-term institutes and workshops and for programs intended to train operating personnel, e.g., linking agents.

3. SCDEs already invested heavily in organizational structures for D&U will propose to use those structures for internship-practicum experiences for students. This will overcome the problem of establishing field linkages noted about (A-6) but may substitute a new problem, i.e., sites too limited to provide experience with new D&U roles.

Predicted Responses to Capacity Building Grants Strategy

A. General Predictions

1. Initiation of a capacity building grant (CBG) program for SCDEs would result in the submission of hundreds of proposals from these agencies. Such a program would fit the past commitment to D&U by SCDEs, the current mission and activities of large numbers of these agencies, and would be viewed as one way to alleviate their current shortage of funds.

---

[24] Ibid., pp. 308-334.

2. Depending upon the orientation of the program, one could anticipate substantial local contributions in time and money to complement the federal investment. This would vary by the extent to which the program emphasized building new capacity, in contrast with improving or expanding extant capacity. SCDEs will be unable to generate much in the way of new monies, but could redirect or even increase faculty time commitments in support of improved or expanded capacity in traditional investments, e.g., school study councils, field service bureaus, resource centers for teachers.

3. A CBG program should anticipate a conflict between new and traditional programs in D&U. The first inclination of SCDEs will be to build on traditional investments--adapting rather than inventing.

4. The end result of a CBG program should not be anticipated as an overall institutional commitment to D&U. SCDEs are, and will remain, "training centers." CBGs will be viewed in the same light as support for R&D centers, i.e., support for a sub-institutional structure in which some faculty will work all the time and many faculty will work some of the time.

5. Unless there is a stipulation to the contrary, each SCDE that is successful in obtaining a CBG will adopt a posture similar to that assumed by many SEAs which have received such grants, to wit, that it is the "sole actor" or leading actor for its state or region. The inclination will be not to cooperate with other agencies invested in D&U.

6. Effects from and expenditures for CBGs will be difficult to assess and monitor. Respondent SCDEs will have difficulty in parceling out D&U activities before, during, and after the grant.

7. A majority of SCDEs will be dissatisfied with whatever criteria are employed to determine the basis, number, and size of CBGs to such agencies. The demand will consistently outrun the supply.

B. Sub-Group Variations

1. Private SCDEs of all institutional types (but especially A-Privates) will be less responsive to CBGs since they often conflict with their missions and current activities.

2. The basic purpose of a CBG program will determine the level of response from SCDE sub-groups, e.g.:

a. A program designed to sustain or improve extant capacity will obviously favor doctoral-level SCDEs.

b. A program designed to expand capacity beyond the number of currently-involved SCDEs will favor master's-level institutions.

3. If proposals for CBGs are judged using standard federal criteria and processes, approved projects will create concentrations not necessarily congruent with program objectives, i.e., in doctoral-level SCDEs with experience in successful proposal writing, in SCDEs with formal D&U structures in place, and in states and regions of the country in which D&U activity is already high.

Predicted Responses to Network Strategy

A. General Predictions

1. Historic and contemporary evidence would argue that SCDEs would respond in large numbers to a program designed to support D&U networks. School study councils, invented by SCDEs, were forerunners of the more recent federal interest in networks. The SCDE response to very modest support from the Kettering Foundation to establish leagues of schools to institutionalize individually-guided education affirms the agency's interest in sponsoring and operating networks.

2. SCDEs have had less experience and success in participation in multiple agency networks on a parity basis. Re-orienting such network support efforts as NDN and RDU to include SCDEs as a participating agency would be of interest to fewer schools of education. However, their current exclusion from many new federal programs, e.g., teacher centers, and their financial plight would tend to offset their historic view of themselves as the keystone agency in network relationships with SEAs and LEAs.

3. There will be a conflict between the desire of SCDEs to obtain support for their existing networks and the interest of the external funding agency to encourage de novo networks. Past evidence on success in institutionalizing arrangements which are supported for some time period with extra-institutional funds would indicate that the former will be easier to sustain after funds are withdrawn than would be the latter.

4. Network involvements will be reinforced in SCDEs by the necessary continuing relationships between LEAs and SCDEs, e.g., student teaching, placement, in-service education, alumni status of teachers.

5. In counterpoint to A.4, contemporary, emerging external impact factors argue that SCDEs will be viewed with suspicion in network relationships by other network participants.

B. Sub-Group Variations

1. If a network strategy builds upon formal structures which already exist in SCDEs, B- and C-Publics will respond in large numbers.

2. The target scope of a network strategy will determine which SCDE institutional type will be best able and most anxious to respond. If the network is interstate or national in scope, it will be congruent with the mission scope of A-Public, A-Private, and B-Public SCDEs. Local, sub-state,

and state foci will attract SCDEs which view themselves as regional influentials, primarily C-Public institutions.

3. The time demands for intensive field activity in networks emphasizing personal linkage roles for faculty will provoke serious conflicts with the reward systems in A-Public and Private SCDEs.

Predicted Responses to Comprehensive Dissemination System Strategy

A. General Predictions

1. SCDEs would emerge as strong participant agencies in a comprehensive dissemination system (CDS) strategy because, in contrast with many other competitive educational agencies they:

a. Have a high current investment in D&U.

b. Possess a well trained manpower resource pool.

c. Are spread geographically throughout the country.

d. Maintain regularized linkages with the R&D community and the community of practice.

2. Variations in the maturity of dissemination and utilization systems already operating within states will modify markedly the most appropriate and effective roles which can be assumed by SCDEs in various states, ranging from keystone agencies for organizing and coordinating a state system to supportive agencies supplying technical assistance and resources.

3. Negotiation of roles which would seem logically appropriate for SCDE(s) within a particular state will be influenced by negative images of SCDEs held by external agencies.

4. Assuming that the purpose of the CDS is more than the sum of its parts, initial SCDE responses to a request for proposals will be too conservative - emphasizing programs in which they are already involved.

B. Sub-Group Variations

1. In a CDS, schools of education of varying institutional types would offer especially strong settings for sub-functions of the system, e.g.:

a. Linking agents and linking roles -- masters level SCDEs; less research-oriented doctoral SCDEs.

b. Networking roles -- SCDEs operating extant networks.

c. System evaluation, planning, technical assistance roles - A-Public and Private SCDEs.

d. Knowledge synthesis roles -- A-Public and Private SCDEs.

2. SCDEs with national mission emphases would respond effectively to national requirements for a CDS, i.e., system planning, coordination, evaluation.

3. Doctoral level SCDE (especially A-Publics and Privates) will confront a conflict situation in responding to CDS:

a. Heavy participation in CDS activities may erode an already weak R&D production capacity in education.

b. Reward systems for faculty will not be attuned to many CDS functions.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FEDERAL INTERVENTION STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION PROGRAMS IN SCHOOLS OF EDUCATION

In the preceding section, the impact on schools of education of four federal intervention strategies in educational D&U was predicted. In this section the predictions will be used to propose a set of recommendations for effective D&U intervention in SCDEs. First, the four interventions will be discussed singly. Finally, a starting point for a federal program supporting D&U in SCDEs will be proposed.

Recommendations for D&U Training Program Grants to SCDEs

Although establishing and operating educational personnel training programs taps an obvious SCDE strength, there are some unique obstacles to effective training for D&U in education, i.e.: 1) neither SCDEs nor any other agency is involved currently in training for such roles; 2) the roles are ill-defined; 3) the training requirements are obscure; 4) the organizational context in which the role will be performed is variable. We would recommend, therefore, that:

1. The initial emphasis for SCDEs in D&U training should be placed on program development grants rather than operating grants. The product of this phase of support should be the generation of model programs which specify roles, training requirements for roles, and training components or interventions appropriate to the requirements.

SCDEs, as noted earlier, would tend to fall back on their training program experience if they were forced prematurely into operating programs for D&U training. This would lead to training proposals for more conventional roles --evaluation, research on D&U, design and operation of information-

science systems. However, the press in educational D&U which is likely to generate the greatest demand for personnel is the use of some form of personal linking agent in D&U systems. Therefore, we would recommend that:

2. A major thrust in both program development grants and, subsequently, training grants should be placed upon training for linking agent roles.

There is every indication that D&U activities and programs in education will continue to be encouraged and supported as a promising route to school improvement. SCDEs are in an excellent position to support this movement in education through modified educational programs beginning for specialized D&U roles. In instituting a support program for D&U training in SCDEs, we would recommend that:

3. The design of a training support program for D&U in SCDEs should reflect a comprehensive view of both training needs and trainers. In soliciting proposals for program development grants and subsequently, operating grants, explicit attention should be paid to the encouragement of :

a. Pre-service and in-service programs for teacher-users.

b. Short and long term training and educational experiences.

c. Programs from masters level as well as doctoral SCDEs.

d. Training for multiple roles, e.g., linkers, users, system planners, evaluators, researchers.

It is probably fair to observe that the difficulty of training for D&U roles which are ill-defined is aggravated by the fact that potential trainers in most agencies, including SCDEs, need re-training in the emerging D&U knowledge base and contemporary experience in D&U programs to perform effectively as trainers. In-service training for professional personnel is not characteristic

of the higher education contextual environment. However, professional personnel are attuned to certain patterns of re-training, e.g., sabbatical leaves and post-doctoral internships, and we would recommend, therefore, that:

4. The training support program should include provisions for post-doctoral training, as did the ESEA - Title IV research training program, but the emphasis in the post-doctoral fellowships should be placed on the training of trainers. Such fellowships might, for example, provide opportunities for professional personnel to work for an academic term in a D&U agency and/or observe, study, or evaluate components of operating D&U systems.

Although the authors would argue that SCDEs are best equipped among educational agencies to assume the "keystone agency" role in personnel training in educational D&U, it is clear that significant training capacity exists in D&U agencies outside SCDEs. This is obviously the case in providing sites for internships and practicums. However, personnel in such agencies should also be encouraged to participate in didactic instruction. We would recommend that:

5. The training support program should be designed to stimulate experimentation in the use of D&U field agencies as sites for internships for trainees and for short term instructional experience directed by field agency personnel. This would require financial support in the training grants to allow D&U agencies to free the time of their personnel to work in such arrangements.

Recommendations for Capacity Building Grants to SCDEs

The recommendations which follow assume that the federal program of capacity building grants in D&U will be continued for some educational agencies. In fact, the authors are unimpressed by the overall strategy. It strikes us

as diffuse, wasteful, and difficult to monitor or assess. With limited funds available to support D&U, our estimate is that a more targeted approach would carry more impact. For example, training grants are obviously a form of capacity building -- the capacity has simply been defined a priori. Attempting to include, in a single agency grant, all forms of extant and potential capacity seems to introduce needless confusion for funders and grant recipients in terms of project expectations.

Nonetheless, the concern of this paper is first and foremost the use of likely federal interventions in D&U with SCDEs. If capacity building is to continue to be used, it should not be restricted to a single agency. If it is, the recipient agency begins to operate under the assumption that it is, and has been selected by the federal government to be, the "keystone agency" in D&U. Extant evidence indicates that: 1) such a favored position is not justified currently for any operating educational agency; 2) the determination of a key agency would vary from state to state; and 3) such a determination is likely to provoke difficulties in encouraging inter-agency linkages, especially so if the key agency has been identified inappropriately in a given state.

Assuming that a capacity building grant program continues to be employed, we recommend that:

1. SCDEs be included as agencies which are eligible to compete for capacity building grants in D&U. Schools of education possess the visible characteristics one would look for in identifying sites for capacity building grants, i.e., institutional commitment to the function area; operating D&U organizations; trained and interested personnel; and geographic dispersion.

Capacity building logically encompasses both strengthening extant capacity and developing capacity where it does not now exist. Even a cursory

examination of D&U activity in education leads to the conclusion that the access of the practitioner to D&U resources is markedly different by states and regions. There are clearly "least well served" teachers and schools in many states. Therefore, we would recommend that:

2. A capacity building grant program for SCDEs should include (a) grants to SCDEs in which D&U capacity is already well established and (b) grants to developing institutions (SCDEs) which might be encouraged to expand or improve their D&U capacity. Emphasis in the latter category ought to be placed upon states in which the current D&U programs are grossly inadequate to provide access to information for practitioners.

Collegial and knowledge support systems for individuals working in educational D&U are not well developed as they are for research and substantive specialties in the field. The concept of capacity building could easily be extended to include the encouragement of intra-school and inter-SCDE collegial groups for sharing data and experiences and offering support to professionals working in relatively uncharted waters. We would recommend that:

3. Capacity building grants be available to individual SCDEs to create intra-school units for personnel working on D&U projects and programs and to regional or national groups of SCDEs to stimulate the formation of "invisible colleges" in educational D&U. In the former case, small grants might be used to provide, for example, a D&U resource center or a D&U lectureship series. In the latter instance, emphasis might be upon a small secretariat for information exchange or funds for occasional seminars or conferences.

Recommendations for Networking Grants to SCDEs

As noted in earlier sections, thousands of LEAs are involved currently in network relationships or ad hoc service projects with SCDEs. That such

relationships exist says little about their present or potential effectiveness. Should such arrangements be supported intact, modified, eliminated, or merged into other network efforts such as NDN or RDU? While a number of evaluations have mounted to assess the effectiveness of networks supported by federal grant monies, little or nothing has been done to evaluate existing D&U networks in education which do not rely primarily on federal funding. We would recommend that:

1. In planning for a program of network support grants for SCDEs, a first step be the establishment of "network evaluation grants" to assess the effectiveness of intact networks involving SCDEs, LEAs, and other educational agencies. Although this is suggested as an initial step, continuance of a systematic program of network evaluation would certainly be recommended.

Since schools of education are already operating networks, and have faculty involved as consultants and specialists in non-SCDE networks, it seems defensible to recommend that:

2. Explicit attention should be given by such federal programs as NDN and RDU to creating a mutually satisfactory mode of involvement by SCDEs in such networks.

3. A new program of grants should be initiated to provide for the support of networks operated by SCDEs. The scope of such a program should be determined at least partially by data obtained from the network evaluation grants. Consideration should be given to existing networks based on their assessed effectiveness. However, experimentation should also be encouraged to stimulate the establishment of new networks ranging from regional clusters of LEAs surrounding an SCDE to consortium of SCDEs working with state and/or inter-state groups of LEAs. This recommendation obviously assumes that the

federal networking strategy in educational D&U will encourage the formation of complementary networks rather than focusing on a single national network.

The role of SCDEs in D&U networks has become stereotyped by their initiation of networks through such devices as school study councils, i.e., the SCDE is viewed as the repository of ideas and expertise which can be shared with practitioner-users. If one were to draw an analog with the National Diffusion Network (NDN) model, SCDEs have been cast in the role of "...LEA-based Developers/Demonstrators who invent and develop new ideas..."[25] In some instances they pursue the function of the "NDN Developer" and actually "...function as technical experts and spokesmen for the individual innovations."[26] Sometimes they serve as "Facilitators" who "...establish the organizational interface between Developers and potential Adopters, and support the adoption process."[27] Never do they assume the adopter role.

Such a stereotype does not fit the demography of SCDEs any better than it would fit LEAs if NDN were to insist that all LEA personnel were Developers/Demonstrators. Many SCDEs are predominantly potential adopters. And they are adopters playing an almost exclusively practitioner role, i.e., both pre- and in-service teacher education. The extent to which they are open, and can become committed, to individual innovations will determine likely improvement in the education of teachers. We would, therefore, recommend that:

4. An NDN-like grants program be initiated which is designed to support the dissemination and institutionalization of innovations in teacher education within SCDEs. The source of such innovations should be considered to be not

---

[25] John A. Emrick and Rekha Agarwala-Rogers, "National Diffusion Network: An Emerging Strategy for Directed Change."

[26] Ibid., p. 112

[27] Loc. cit.

only other SCDE Developer/Demonstrators but LEA Developer/Demonstrators so that innovative LEA-based programs can be used directly to effect changes in teacher preparation.

The concept of D&U networks in education involving personal linking agents inevitably confronts the issue of finding dollars to support this function in tightening educational budgets at the local, state, and national levels. SCDE faculty, with and without institutional support and sanction, have been involved extensively in relationships with LEAs and classroom teachers. They are also at a point in time when the demand on their personnel resources for teacher training has declined. Provided with an opportunity to utilize some personnel resources for formal linking agent functions, SCDEs, with state support, might be interested and willing to attempt to match federal grants for extension agent services to SEAs. The use of state funds to support such a function is consistent with 1) the public university, land grant concept, 2) past state support to SCDEs for D&U purposes, 3) the state's historic investment in agricultural extension, and 4) the state's overall investment in public elementary and secondary education. We would recommend that:

5. An exploratory design program, and a matching grants program for operations, be initiated in a few selected states to experiment with the use of SCDE faculty as linking or extension agents to LEAs. Masters level public SCDEs would seem to be especially likely sites for such programs since they have experienced sharp enrollment declines and would be able to reward professional personnel appropriately for these field-based activities. The program(s) initiated with such grants should be statewide in scope, not restricted to individual SCDEs.

Recommendations for Comprehensive Dissemination System Grants to SCDEs

If the federal government elects to initiate grants to support a more comprehensive dissemination system in education, we have no hesitancy in recommending that:

1. Schools of education should be included as a major participating agency in any national program of comprehensive dissemination system grants. As has been noted, their resources and interest justify inclusion and they would be able, as a total group, to support a range of roles varying from operating agencies in the system to the conduct of research and evaluation on the system.

The maturity of D&U systems in education varies markedly by state. This variation should be reflected in designing and planning for the operation of a CDS and, consequently, the specific role of SCDEs in the system should vary based upon SCDE and state characteristics. We would recommend that CDS planning be based upon:

2. An expanded national program of research on the D&U system in education which includes:

a. Continued study of operating agencies which will be functioning in the system. Data of the sort reported in this paper on SCDEs are not available for most of the operating agencies in education. And even the data on SCDEs is obviously insufficient in many respects, e.g., the effects of information flow involving SCDEs; interactions of SCDEs and other system components; actual budgetary contributions of SCDEs to D&U, etc.

b. Expansion of the data base on D&U activities and out-puts by state. The data reported herein on SCDEs are inadequate to describe that agency's D&U activity at a state level and almost nothing is known,

except at a gross descriptive level, about the total D&U system variances by state. Eventually, the field will need social system and information flow descriptions of intra-state D&U activity.

Without the information base called for in the previous recommendation, the initiation of a national comprehensive dissemination system would be costly and wasteful. However, there is no reason to assume that limited experimentation with selected states should not begin. This experimentation can be considered one additional method to add to what must be known about state-based comprehensive dissemination systems. We would recommend that:

3. A competitive grants program be initiated to design several state-based comprehensive dissemination systems in states with varying levels of current capacity in dissemination; and that, as soon as feasible, experimentation with and evaluation of a small number of planned variations in CDS programs be established in selected states.

Summary: A Beginning

The implementation of the foregoing recommendations would involve an expenditure of funds in support of D&U which seems unlikely to occur, especially when one considers that these recommendations concentrate attention on a single operating agency. If the recommendations were extended, as they should be, to involve other operating agencies with extant and potential capacity in D&U, the fiscal feasibility of such recommendations for the immediate future would appear even less likely.

The fact is that an effective and powerful D&U system will cost money. The choice of whether or not to make the level of investment required by such

a system will come down finally to a judgment of the necessity of the system in effecting school improvement. Our judgment is that it is necessary. We would judge further that the necessity of an effective D&U system to education is a position being assumed by an increasing number of national-level educational planners in the legislative and executive branches of government and in practitioner-oriented professional associations. During a period of conservative responses to expenditures for education, programs for expanded and more effective D&U capacity directed toward school improvement still have currency and cogency.

These assumptions lead us to the conclusion that it is not unreasonable to expect that initial steps toward the recommendations in this paper could be made in the near future. If a relatively modest budget allocation of about five million dollars is envisioned, a first year program could be mounted which would include:

- Twenty program development grants for D&U training with an emphasis on the design of effective training for linking agent roles (1.0 to 1.5 million dollars).
- Ten network evaluation grants to assess the effectiveness of intact SCDE networks (.75 million dollars).
- Five to ten design and experimental grants to examine the feasibility and effect of SCDE institutional participation in existing federal networks and the establishment of networks to disseminate and institutionalize innovations in teacher education programs (1.0 million dollars).
- Expanded research on operating D&U agencies, D&U activities, and interactions and outputs by state (1.5 million dollars).
- Five to ten design grants for state-based comprehensive dissemination systems (1.0 million dollars).

Even this minimal program could be reduced further since the proposed activities are complementary rather than inter-dependent. At this point in development of more effective D&U systems in education, the authors would argue that a beginning which involves SCDEs in the federal D&U, strategy is a worthwhile end in itself.

APPENDIX A

TECHNICAL NOTES

NOTE #1: SCDE MISSIONS

Data Sources

Institutional Questionnaire Items

2.3 Regardless of the document(s) furnished in 2.2 above (SCDE mission statement), please fill in the table on the following pages indicating your opinion of the extent to which the faculty and administration of the SCDE emphasize certain non-teaching activities.

Activity	Emphasis Placed on Activity in SCDE			
	Central to SCDE Mission	Of Some Interest to SCDE	A Few Faculty Involved	Of No Interest to SCDE
Developing generalizable educational products, e.g., texts, other curricular materials *				
Testing and evaluating generalizable educational products and services				
Disseminating information about educational innovations				
Effecting change in elementary and secondary schools				
Evaluating school practices				
Producing basic knowledge about education *				
Maintaining a data base for and about education *				
Producing applied knowledge about education *				
Conducting in-service projects and programs for school personnel (excluding regular advanced degree programs)				
Providing individually negotiated consultant assistance				
Conducting field service projects with and for schools				
Demonstrating new practices and innovations				
Servicing and nurturing new programs that have been installed in schools				
Other (specify):				

*These activities were judged not to pertain to D&U and were not used.

Faculty Questionnaire Items

10. Different schools, colleges, and departments of education (SCDEs) select different missions for themselves, as do individual faculty members. In column A of the table below, please indicate the current importance of each of the indicated missions in your SCDE by circling 1 - centrally important, 2 - moderately important, and 3 - not important. In column B, please indicate for each mission whether you believe its importance in your SCDE will change over the next five years by circling 1 - increase in importance, 2 - remain the same, and 3 - decrease in importance.

Mission	SCDE	
	Now A	Future B
1. Teaching and instruction	1 2 3	1 2 3
2. Research and scholarly productivity	1 2 3	1 2 3
3. Development, dissemination, and demonstration *	1 2 3	1 2 3
4. Ad hoc services to schools and other educational agencies	1 2 3	1 2 3
5. Effecting change in schools or other ecucational agencies **	1 2 3	1 2 3

*including the design and preparation of generalizable instructional materials such as textbooks, audio-visuals, workbooks, etc.; of teaching techniques, administrative patterns, and other novel concepts, practices, or artifacts; dissemination of information about or demonstration of any of the foregoing to a wide range of potential adopters; or evaluation of any of the foregoing.

**including needs assessments, assistance in selecting new programs or practices responsive to local needs, retraining of faculty and staff as required by newly installed innovations, demonstrating new approaches that are under consideration for adoption, servicing and nurturing newly installed programs.

The responses to missions 1 and 2 as well as the responses under column B did not pertain to current SCDE missions in D&U and were not used.

Rules for Classifying SCDEs by Institutional Mission

Three sources of information were available on most of the SCDEs relevant to the strength of the institutional commitment to dissemination and utilization activities, i.e.,:

- A formal document or mission statement for the SCDE.
- The SCDE chief administrator's perception of the emphasis on D&U activity areas within the SCDE mission.
- Faculty perceptions of the importance of D&U activity areas to the SCDE missions.

In classifying the SCDEs by institutional mission emphases the authors assumed that the sources were of variable validity, i.e., the formal document had the strongest claim to face validity as a relatively stable statement of institutional purposes usually sanctioned formally by one or more segments of the institution; the faculty perceptions of mission emphasis represented multiple responses and were judged, consequently, to be the second most valid information source; the administrator's perceptions were judged the least valid, being based on the response of a single individual.

Ranking by Formal Mission Statement

Strong commitment. A formal document indicative of strong commitment to D and U mentioned at least three distinct KU activity areas as institutional goals or commitments.

Moderately committed. Documents which included one or two of the most frequently mentioned KU activity areas--field service and in-service activities--were judged to express a moderate commitment to D&U.

No commitment. Documents which made no mention of KU activity areas.

Ranking by Faculty Perceptions of SCDE Mission Emphases

Faculty responses tended to cluster in the moderately important response category. Thus, the items were scored in terms of a response tendency, i.e., most responses falling in moderate and central, or in moderate and not important, or equally balanced about moderate.

Strong KU Emphasis. A faculty response in which at least one of the three activities was perceived as central to the SCDE mission.

Moderate KU Emphasis. A faculty response in which at least one of the three activities was perceived as moderately important to the SCDE mission.

Low KU Emphasis. A faculty response in which all three activities were perceived as not important to the SCDE mission.

Ranking by SCDE Chief Administrator's Perceptions of Institutional Mission

The administrators were asked to rate nine KU activity areas in relation to the SCDE mission and their responses were scored as follows: the total number of activities rated central to the SCDE mission was multiplied by 2; the total number of activities rated as of some interest to the SCDE was multiplied by 1; the total number of activities in which few faculty were involved was multiplied by 0; and the total number of activities of no interest to the SCDE was multiplied by -1. Thus, it was possible to convert the administrator's perceptions of SCDE mission emphases in D&U to a numerical score on a scale ranging from 18 to -9.

Strong KU Emphasis. Administrators who rated their SCDE from 12 to 18 were judged to be indicating strong support for KU activities within the SCDE mission.

Moderate KU Emphasis. Administrators who rated their SCDE from 5 to 11 were judged to be indicating moderate support for KU activities within the SCDE mission.

Low KU Emphasis. Administrators who rated their SCDE 4 or lower were judged to be indicating low support for KU activities within the SCDE mission.

Summary Ranking by Institutional Mission

Strongly Committed. This is a relatively "pure" group, expressing nearly unequivocal support for D&U activities. Two of the three data sources must have reported a high commitment, and no source reported a low commitment. Only one source of data could be missing and, if one was, the two remaining must have indicated a high commitment to KU activity areas.

Positive Support. This is an above average group characterized by high to moderate reports on the importance of KU activities to the SCDE mission. Specifically, institutions in this group were rated highly committed by either the formal document or the faculty. No low ratings were included, except by the faculty, and then only if the formal document and the administrator's perceptions rated the SCDE highly involved. Institutions with no formal document, high ratings by the faculty, and moderate ratings by the administrator were placed in this group.

Acceptance. The SCDEs in this group must have been rated moderately committed by the formal document and at least one other source. However, if the faculty and the administrator perceived a high commitment and the formal document showed a low commitment, the institution was placed in this group.

Weak Commitment. Institutions in this group exhibited some interest in KU activities. These SCDEs were rated low on evidence from at least two

sources, unless the formal document was judged to indicate a low commitment (made no mention of KU activities) and then that was sufficient to place an institution in this group. If the formal document was missing, faculty perceptions of low commitment were sufficient to place an institution in this group.

Little or No Commitment. This group appeared uninterested in KU activities. The institutions were rated low on evidence from at least the formal document and the faculty perceptions. If a data source was not available, then the most valid source must have rated the institution low and the remaining source no higher than moderate.

Ambiguous Commitment. This cluster of SCDEs did not fit any one of the five previous groups. Their commitment to KU activities was ambiguous due to different perceptions of the role of D&U in the institutional mission from each source.

NOTE #2: SCDE INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURES
IN SUPPORT OF D&U

Data Sources

All the items relating to institutional structures in SCDEs for D&U were taken from the institutional questionnaire.

3.1 Does your SCDE have a bureau, institute or center for research, development, evaluation, dissemination, special training or field service activities?

3.1.1 Yes_____ No_____ (If No, move to item 3.1.9.)
If Yes, please attach to this questionnaire any available brochures or documents describing such unit(s).

3.1.2 Brochures or documents enclosed: Yes_____ No_____
If No, please describe the unit(s) briefly in the space below. If the space provided is insufficient on this or subsequent questions, use the reverse side of the page.

3.1.3 Name(s) of bureau(s), institute(s), or center(s)
(a)_____
(b)_____
(c)_____

3.1.4 Primary process orientation of each unit designated above, e.g., research, development, field service, evaluation, etc.
(a)_____
(b)_____
(c)_____

3.1.5 Primary substantive orientation of each unit designated above, e.g., special education, urban education, educational administration, etc.

(a)_____

(b)_____

(c)_____

3.2 Are any personnel within your SCDE released on a full or part time basis to stimulate, coordinate, monitor, or support R&D, evaluation, dissemination, special training, and field service activities within the unit? Do you, for example, have an assistant dean for R&D; or a coordinator of field services; or a consultant on design or statistical problems, etc.

3.2.1 Yes_____ No_____ (If No, move to item 3.2.6.)

3.2.4 Titles and designated responsibilities:

(a) Title:_____

Responsibilities:_____

(b) Title:_____

Responsibilities:_____

(c) Title:_____

Responsibilities:_____

3.3 Does your SCDE maintain a faculty committee charged with responsibility for stimulating, coordinating, monitoring, or supporting research, development, evaluation, dissemination, special training, or field service activities?

3.3.1 Yes_____ No_____

3.3.2 If Yes, please specify below the primary responsibilities and

emphases of the committee's work:

_____

_____

_____

3.5 Within your SCDE do you maintain:

3.5.1 A laboratory or demonstration school? Yes_____ No_____

3.5.2 An in-house journal, newsletter, or occasional paper series in which faculty publish regularly?

3.5.2.1 Yes_____ No_____

3.5.2.2 If Yes, please provide the title of this publication(s):

_____

_____

3.13 For many years, some SCDEs have maintained formal relationships with state and local education agencies to foster joint involvement in R&D, evaluation, dissemination, special training, and field service activities. Early prototypes of these arrangements were the school study councils. More recently, teacher centers, dissemination and installation consortia such as the Individually Guided Education leagues of schools, in-service training and development centers for teachers, and arrangements with regional educational laboratories have been established. Does your SCDE maintain any regular relationships with local education agencies, state education agencies, regional, state, or national groups, professional associations, and the like, to foster R&D, evaluation, dissemination, special training, or field service activities? (Please do not include field arrangements in which the sole purpose is to provide placement for student teachers.)

3.13.1 Yes_____ No_____ (If No, move to item 3.14.)

3.13.2 If Yes, and you have a brochure(s) describing the relationship, please enclose it with the questionnaire.

Brochure enclosed: Yes_____ No_____

3.13.3 For such relationships where a brochure is not enclosed, please describe them briefly below:

(a) Name (e.g., "X" School Study Council, "Y" Consortium or League of Schools, "Z" Teacher Center):

_____

_____

Primary Function (e.g., assisting in school evaluation, developing instructional materials, etc.):

_____

_____

Types of member agencies (e.g., local education agencies, state education agency, other SCDEs, etc.):

_____

_____

(b) Name (e.g., "X" School Study Council, "Y" Consortium or League of Schools, "Z" Teacher Center):

_____

_____

Primary Function (e.g., assisting in school evaluation, developing instructional materials, etc.):

_____

_____

Types of member agencies (e.g., local education agencies, state education agency, other SCDEs, etc.):

_____

_____

3.15 Are there any special arrangements, e.g., joint appointments or inter-departmental projects or centers, which bring together education faculty and faculty from other academic units to work on education R&D, evaluation, dissemination, special training, or field service projects?

3.15.1 Yes_____ No_____

3.15.2 If Yes, please describe them briefly.

_____

_____

4.5 Service to public and private schools has been a common feature of SCDE operation for many years. In your SCDE:

4.5.2 Does your SCDE maintain service arrangements with schools in which faculty members participate as a part of their regular load?

Yes_____ No_____

4.5.3 If Yes, please list up to three examples in the spaces below, e.g., conducted curriculum survey for X school district; ran on-site workshop for Y, etc.

(a)_____

(b)_____

(c)_____

Rules for Classifying SCDEs by Formal Institutional Structures

The SCDE chief administrator reported on the foregoing eight possible formal structures supporting D&U activities. Of these eight, three seemed to require substantial institutional effort and direct expense and were deemed critical in assessing institutional support of D&U:

- Maintenance of a bureau or institute.
- Formal arrangements with agencies outside the SCDE (leagues, consortia) in support of D&U.
- Service arrangements with schools in which faculty participate as part of their regular load.

Highly Supportive. Institutions which reported the existence of two of the three key formal structures were judged to be highly supportive of D&U.

Moderately Supportive. SCDEs providing moderate support for D&U maintained only one of three key formal structures, or no key structures and three additional formal structures, i.e., laboratory school, in-house journal or newsletter, designated personnel, faculty committees, or interdepartmental arrangements.

Low Support. The institutions providing little organizational support reported no key formal structures and up to two other formal structures.

NOTE #3: SCDE PRACTICES

IN FACULTY RECRUITMENT AND EVALUATION

Data Sources

Institutional Questionnaire Items

3.8 Please enclose with this questionnaire any formal statement your institution has adopted regarding criteria for promotion and/or tenure.

Statement enclosed: Yes_____ No_____

3.8.1 Of the following commonly employed criterion areas which are used in your SCDE in evaluating faculty for promotion and tenure?

Criterion Areas	Employed as Criterion for:	
	Promotion	Tenure
Teaching *		
Research *		
Service		

*Not pertinent to D&U, not used.

3.9 In recruiting new faculty for your unit, how important would you consider the following abilities: (please check each item)

Characteristics of New Faculty	Degree of Importance		
	Essential	Helpful	Not Important
Likely success in instruction*			
Evidence of prior publication *			
Graduate level R&D training			
Likely success in working with personnel in school settings			

*These items were not pertinent to D&U and were not used.

Faculty Questionnaire Items

14. Different colleges and universities place different weight on faculty participation in the several missions when considering them for promotion and tenure. In the table below indicate the weight placed by your institution on involvement in each of the missions by circling 1 - essential, 2 - helpful, and 3 - not considered.

	Tenure			Promotion		
1. Teaching and instruction *	1	2	3	1	2	3
2. Research and scholarly productivity *	1	2	3	1	2	3
3. Development, dissemination, and demonstration	1	2	3	1	2	3
4. Ad hoc services to schools and other educational agencies	1	2	3	1	2	3
5. Effecting change in schools and other educational agencies	1	2	3	1	2	3

*Not pertinent to D&U, not used.

Rules for Classifying SCDEs by Personnel Policies

Three sources of information were available on the SCDEs relevant to the emphasis placed on D&U activities by SCDE personnel policies:

- The formal statement of promotion and tenure criteria.
- The SCDE chief administrator's perception of the emphasis placed on D&U in faculty recruitment and evaluation.
- Faculty perceptions of the weight placed on D&U activity areas in promotion and tenure decisions.

Highly Supportive. Institutions considered to be highly supportive of D&U activities in their personnel policies were those in which either:

1. The administrator deemed likely success in school settings "essential" in recruitment, the formal document and administrator each reported the use of service or KU activities as a criterion in promotion and tenure decisions, and the faculty perceived involvement in all three D&U activity areas to be "essential to helpful" or merely "helpful" in promotion and tenure decisions; or

2. The administrator deemed likely success in school settings "helpful" in recruitment, the formal document and administrator each reported the use of service or KU activities as a criterion in promotion and tenure decisions, and the faculty perceived involvement in three D&U activities to be "essential to helpful" in promotion and tenure decisions.

Moderately Supportive. These institutions submitted evidence of support for KU in the institutional reward system but there was inconsistency across the data sources. Specifically, SCDEs in this group were those in which the administrator deemed likely success in school settings to be "essential" or "helpful" in recruitment and either:

1. There was no formal statement of promotion and tenure criteria, the administrator reported that service was a criterion in promotion and tenure decisions, and the faculty perceived that KU activities were "helpful" or "helpful to not important" in their evaluation.

2. Both the formal document and the administrator reported the use of KU activities as a criterion in promotion and tenure decisions, while the faculty perceived that KU activities were "helpful to not important" in promotion and tenure decisions.

3. The administrator and formal document disagreed about the use of KU activities in promotion and tenure decisions, and the faculty perceived that KU activities were "helpful" or "helpful to not important" in promotion and tenure decisions.

Low Support. SCDEs so designated overtly singled out KU activities as unimportant to the careers of their faculty by either:

1. Noting that likely success in school settings was unimportant in recruitment. Only three SCDEs reported that this was the case.
2. Omitting KU activities in the criteria included in the formal document and having this confirmed by either the response of the administrator or faculty.

NOTE #4: RULES FOR CLASSIFYING SCDEs

BY ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Highly Supportive. Institutions in this group provided significant organizational support to faculty engaged in D&U activities. They reported at least two of the three key formal institutional structures and considered involvement with D&U to be moderately important in faculty recruitment and evaluation.

Moderately Supportive. These SCDEs maintained institutional structures (one key structure or three other structures) and considered D&U involvement to be either important or moderately important in faculty recruitment and evaluation. Also included in this group were SCDEs in which the support for D&U activities was inconsistent across the component areas of structures and personnel practices, i.e.:

1. The SCDE provided high support through formal structures (at least two of the three) but considered D&U involvement of little importance in faculty recruitment and evaluation.
2. The SCDE provided little formal support for D&U activities, but did consider D&U involvement an important criterion in recruitment and evaluation.

Low Support. These institutions offered only minimal support for D&U:

1. The SCDE provided little formal support and considered D&U involvement to be either moderately or not important in faculty recruitment and evaluation.
2. The SCDE provided moderate formal support (at least one key formal structure) but considered D&U involvement unimportant in faculty recruitment.

NOTE #5: PROCESS: MEASURES OF FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN D&U

Data Sources

Institutional Questionnaire Items

4.5 Service to public and private schools has been a common feature of SCDE operation for many years. In your SCDE:

4.5.4 Do school systems in your area seek out formal assistance from your SCDE in attempting to adopt or generate new programs or to solve local problems?

_____ Frequently

_____ Occasionally

_____ Hardly at all

Faculty Questionnaire Items

15. Listed below is a series of activities in which you may be engaged or might like to engage in the future. In the first column, indicate your current activity (i.e., during the past 12 months) by circling 1 - yes, or 2 - no. In the second column indicate whether you might like to engage in activity in the future (whether or not you are engaged in it currently) by circling 1 - yes, or 2 - no.

Activity	Current	Future
1. Publish in practitioner-oriented journals, such as Today's Education, Arithmetic Teacher, or Educational Leadership.	1 2	1 2
2. Serve as editor or on an editorial committee for practitioner-oriented journals.	1 2	1 2

(table continued)

Activity	Current	Future *
3. Present papers or speeches at practioner-oriented conferences such as AASA or state teachers association meetings.	1 2	1 2
4. Publish in research-oriented journals, such as American Educational Research Journal, History of Education Quarterly, or Sociology of Education. *	1 2	1 2
5. Serve as editor or on an editorial committee for research-oriented journals, as above. *	1 2	1 2
6. Present papers or speeches at research-oriented conferences, such as the American Psychological Association, the American Educational Research Association, or the National Association for Research in Science Teaching. *	1 2	1 2
7. Serve as a consultant, writer, or evaluator for publishers of educational materials. *	1 2	1 2
8. Design or develop educational materials used in colleges or schools, such as texts, films, or workbooks. *	1 2	1 2
9. Render ad hoc services to schools or other educational agencies, e.g., on-site workshops, operating surveys or studies, or consulting.	1 2	1 2
10. Serve as an officer or committee member for a state or national level professional association. *	1 2	1 2

*The responses to these items were not directly relevant to current faculty involvement in D&U and were not used.

Rules for Classifying SCDEs by Process Measures

In rating institutional involvement for each activity, a simple scoring technique was used. The percentage of faculty members claiming current involvement with each activity was computed and scored as follows:

76% - 100% involved----------5

51% - 75% involved----------4

26% - 50% involved----------3

11% - 25% involved----------2

0 - 10% involved----------1

Likewise the administrator's estimation of the frequency of LEA requests was scored:

Frequent----------5

Occasionally----------3

Hardly at all----------1

The scores across the items were totaled for each SCDE and four groups were formed on the basis of the final distribution:

Most Faculty Involved-----N=22-----(total score 19, 20, 21)

Many Faculty Involved-----N=25-----(total score 17, 18)

Some Faculty Involved-----N=22-----(total score 14, 15, 16)

Few Faculty Involved------N=17-----(total score 13 or lower)

Six institutions in the sample returned no faculty questionnaires and could not be classified.

NOTE #6: DATA SOURCES FOR INSTITUTIONAL PRODUCTIVITY IN D&U

The data on SCDE productivity in practitioner-oriented educational journals were obtained from a study of 13 national journals, selected on the basis of a prior survey of researcher- and practitioner-oriented emphases among educational journals and the circulation totals for these journals.[1] The thirteen journals included in the study were: (1) American Vocational Journal, (2) Arithmetic Teacher, (3) Clearinghouse, (4) Educational Leadership, (5) Elementary School Journal, (6) Instructor, (7) National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, (8) Personnel and Guidance Journal, (9) Phi Delta Kappan, (10) Reading Teacher, (11) School Review, (12) School Science and Mathematics, and (13) Today's Education. The authors of the articles, reviews and essays appearing in these journals over a three year period (c. 1972-1974) were tracked to the institutions in which they were employed at the time of publication. Contributions were credited to the institution in credits of one per article; in the case of multiple authorship the single credit was equally divided among the institutions employing the authors.

The data on KU contributions from SCDEs to the Resources in Education section of ERIC were obtained by classifying all SCDE contributions to RIE over a two year period (1 April 1973 - 31 March 1975) as predominantly KP or KU or involving activities encompassing both. The contributions were credited to the institutions in the same manner as the journal articles.

---

[1] Annie W. Ward, Bruce W. Hall, and Charles F. Schramm, "Evaluation of Published Educational Research: A National Study," (American Educational Research Journal, Vol. 12, no. 2, Spring, 1975), pp. 109-28.

The convention data resulted from a classification of 50% of the presentations at six national conventions over a three year period as either KU or KP.[2] The conventions included were: American Association of School Administrators, American Educational REsearch Association, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Council for Exceptional Children, National Council for the Social Studies, and the National Education Association.

[2]All AERA presentations were arbitrarily coded as KP; all AASA presentations were coded as KU. The 1973 AERA convention was coded completely.

NOTE #7: RULES FOR COMBINING SCDE CLASSIFICATIONS ACROSS RESPONSE CATEGORIES

In order to combine the responses of SCDEs across the four categories on which data were gathered, i.e., mission, organizational arrangements, processes, and products, dichotomous groups were formed for each category. The rules governing the assignment of SCDEs to these groups by category were:

Mission

Positive response - Groups 1, 2, 3:

In order to be considered involved with D&U or the mission level, an SCDE had to at least accept D&U activities as a legitimate mission focus.

Negative response - Groups 4, 5, 6:

The institutions in Groups 4 and 5 exhibited minimal to no interest in D&U mission areas. An additional 16 SCDEs in Group 6 were assigned to the negative response category because the data in regard to their mission commitment was ambiguous.

Organizational Arrangements

Positive response - Groups 1, 2:

In order to be considered supportive of D&U activities an SCDE had to provide at least moderate support for D&U activities.

Negative response - Group 3:

These institutions provided few supports for D&U activities.

Process

Positive response - Groups 1, 2:

In order to be considered as actively engaged in D&U, circa 50% of the faculty who responded were participating in D&U activities.

Negative response - Groups 3, 4, and "No Data":

SCDEs in Groups 3 and 4 had less than 50% of their faculty engaged currently in D&U activity. Six SCDEs provided no data in regard to faculty participation in D&U and were assigned arbitrarily to the negative response category.

Productivity

Positive response - Groups 1, 2:

SCDEs in these groups were above the median on the measures of productivity.

Negative response - Groups 3, 4:

SCDEs in these groups were below the median on the productivity measures.

NOTE #8: CONTEXTUAL CONDITIONS AFFECTING SCDE INVOLVEMENT IN D&U

The RITE study project staff conducted site visits to 20 SCDEs of varying types. During these visits, the co-investigators became convinced that contextual conditions within the SCDEs and their parent institutions of higher education (IHEs) were powerful determinants as to why institutional and individual decisions had been made or were likely to be made.

The significance of the contextual conditions became apparent when the likely effect of external impact factors on SCDEs was assessed. If, for example, the demand for general secondary teachers was declining while the demand for special education teachers was increasing why would SCDEs not adjust their staffing patterns to fit the demand? Several contextual features seemed to explain their apparent unresponsiveness, i.e., the idiographic culture of SCDEs and IHEs; the minimal opportunities and expectations for in-service or retraining opportunities for faculty; the job security of faculty with tenure in even low demand areas. The conclusion drawn by the researchers was that future projections for SCDEs would only be realistic if they assessed the interaction of external impact factors with these contextual factors.

From the comprehensive inventory prepared in the RITE study, the current investigators selected the following contextual factors as those most likely to affect SCDE decisions in regard to involvement in D&U programs and activities. Depending upon the nature of the D&U activity and the external impacts brought to bear on the SCDE, any given factor may facilitate, inhibit, or not affect at all the response of the SCDE. For example, SCDEs

seem very responsive to institutional mission change or expansion, on the one hand, but, on the other, have a history of assuming such missions without serious consideration to the trade-offs involved in taking on new or expanded missions. The former characteristic makes them likely targets for external change agents interested in involving them in new D&U programs, but the latter raises doubts about the institutionalization of the programs unless external funding is to be continued indefinitely.

The identified contextual factors likely to affect D&U involvement by SCDEs are grouped under nine general headings, i.e., mission, faculty utilization, organizational arrangements, organizational characteristics, faculty characteristics, the reward system, external images, internal status, and responses to change.

SCDE Mission

1. Some SCDEs adopt missions which are not synchronized with their faculty strengths, constituency, base of fiscal support, or general IHE environment. These mission mismatches almost always lead to low morale and productivity.

2. Mission over-reach builds up over time as pressures increase on the SCDE to take on all the problems confronted by education in a community, region, or state. The sharpest examples of this problem in recent years come from urban-based SCDEs which have been pressed to solve the urban community's educational problems with a handful of staff hired to teach classes to graduate and undergraduate students.

3. The status of an activity within an IHE generally affects the position accorded that activity in the SCDE mission statements, e.g.,

relatively few SCDEs eschew the research mission although the level of research activity in most SCDEs is low.

4. SCDEs seem to give little time and attention to the trade-offs involved in the assumption of new or expanded missions. New missions are accepted as good things to do, opportunities not to be lost. The opportunity costs, what will have to be given up, curtailed, or done less well, are rarely or incompletely considered.

Development and Utilization of SCDE Faculty

1. Beyond the regularized assignment of faculty to class loads, the availability of faculty resources to support new institutional KU thrusts, especially non-traditional KU programs involving field-based activity, is often more apparent than real.

2. The "limited draw" available to the dean in redeploying personnel to new institutional emphases is exacerbated in IHEs/SCDEs by cultural characteristics which make the very concept of personnel redeployment inconsistent with the IHE value system, i.e., idiographic emphases, the professor as entrepreneur and specialist, tenured security of the professor, collegial governance.

Organizational Arrangements in SCDEs

1. Because of their high external visibility and ease of creation, bureaus, centers and institutes are employed frequently as a mechanism for initiating new thrusts in SCDEs.

2. Fewer general purpose, permanent research and service bureaus are being established in SCDEs. Contemporary centers tend to have a specified substantive emphasis, and an ad hoc organizational mandate. They are more opportunistic in response to external funding possibilities, and more likely to change either their substantive or process focus.

3. KPU units have often been charged with unrealistic and/or conflicting demands by SCDEs. Simultaneously, they have been expected to be (1) change agencies stimulating and modeling KPU behavior in and for the entire SCDE faculty; (2) externally oriented agencies responding flexibly to outside funding opportunities; (3) linking agencies bridging researcher and practitioner interests in research, service, development, and diffusion.

4. Extant bureaus and centers in SCDEs exhibit symptoms of an aging process which interferes with their productivity. The pressure frequently placed on such units to generate a programmatic thrust or hallmark subsequently impedes their ability to respond to emerging social-educational demands and funding opportunities. The few internally funded positions become clogged with tenured personnel of fixed interests and, sometimes, declining productivity.

5. If KPU centers begin to lose capacity to attract external resources, they often are subject to sharp criticism internally since they do not typically have a regularized line function, e.g., instruction, to fall back on as a productive, money-producing institutional contribution.

6. The most powerful, and most expensive, support mechanisms for faculty in KPU are (1) released time for faculty designated for KPU activity and (2) selection and selective retention of faculty with strong KPU interests.

7. What appear to be powerful organizational support mechanisms for faculty involvement in KPU are blunted in their impact if the institution has no history or tradition of productivity in KPU. It is not possible to overcome quickly deficiencies in the socialization of faculty to KPU productivity by introducing organizational support mechanisms.

8. IHEs and SCDEs often pose expectations for faculty involvement in KPU without providing the support implied by those expecations.

9. Public and private doctoral level institutions approach the question of organizing to support faculty involvement in KPU differently. The public institutions frequently employ formal mechanisms, e.g., coordinators of research, faculty symposia, etc. The private institutions rely more heavily on informal processes of socialization and selective retention to attain their ends.

Organizational and Cultural Characteristics and Norms

1. The culture of institutions of higher education is predominantly idiographic rather than nomothetic.

2. IHEs do not have the same institutionally based prudential checks and balances for individual performance characteristics of many other bureaucracies. Faculty members and administrators can succeed in enhancing their professional status on a national basis while failing to contribute proportionately to institutional goals or, in some instances, while contributing to the failure of local institutional goals.

3. The budgets and resources of SCDEs are labor intensive, i.e., concentrated heavily on personnel costs in contrast to other cost areas.

4. Investments in KPU activity by SCDEs, where they exist at all, show up in the form of reduced teaching loads for faculty. However, such provisions are typically "bled-out" of the budget after the fact rather than being built into the operating budget, e.g., research center public institutions assign released time for faculty involvement in KPU but still maintain a very high student-faculty instructional ratio. The very use of

the term "release time" for KPU establishes its complementary rather than core status among faculty activities in SCDEs.

5. IHEs and SCDEs are bound tightly in their fiscal structure to instructional headcount budgeting.

SCDE Faculty Characteristics

1. Socialization to KPU activity to SCDEs requires higher institutional effort than socialization to teaching since the latter is an immediate and regularized part of the professor's assignment while the former is not.

2. Pre-employment socialization to KPU productivity is infrequent for beginning SCDE professors.

3. Post-employment socialization of SCDE professors to KPU activity varies across the entire spectrum--none to all. In general, however, the socialization processes are weak in R&D and scholarly productivity, especially when compared to teaching and, to a lesser extent, service.

4. The disparity between actual SCDE faculty involvement in, and their aspirations for involvement in KPU are startling. SCDE faculty are, in general, dissatisfied with their current level of productivity in and utilization of time for KPU.

5. Inter-institutional collegiality (invisible colleges) is more oriented to KP exchange than to KU or teaching activities. These latter exchanges would be more likely to occur through "close-in" regional groupings of institutions. Such consortia or groups of SCDEs are infrequent and, where they exist, are more likely to involve administrators than faculty members.

6. Most professors in SCDEs begin their careers with a low level of training and experience in KPU.

7. SCDEs/IHEs have minimal in-service or retraining opportunities for faculty during their careers.

Faculty Reward Systems

1. The consistent evidence that SCDEs will continue to place emphasis on traditional function areas in faculty evaluation is likely to cause serious problems for individual faculty who become involved in emergent areas in knowledge utilization. SCDEs can predict a continuing conflict between expectations held by reference groups in the field and those held and rewarded by the IHE.

2. In the immediate past (three to five years), and for the foreseeable future, IHEs/SCDEs have and will continue to place a heavier emphasis on research and scholarly productivity in assessing faculty for promotion and tenure than has been the case previously. Substitute criteria for R&D productivity are less frequently being allowed.

3. Faculty engaged productively in function areas which are traditionally of high status in IHEs (research, scholarly publication) are rewarded; faculty engaged productively in emergent function areas (KU activities) and/or traditional areas which are low status in IHEs (service, undergraduate instruction) are commended.

4. Shifting institutional missions or mission emphases always catch short some proportion of the faculty who were employed under one set of conditions and expectations and now work under another. The conflict is most dramatic in its effect on junior faculty who are seeking promotion

and tenure, but may be equally difficult for more veteran faculty whose contribution becomes less valued.

External Images of SCDEs

During periods of mission activity transition, SCDEs suffer from an image "time-lag." In some instances, this may mean that the institution is living on its reputation; in others, opportunities may be thwarted because of the SCDE is underestimated.

Status of the SCDE Within the IHE

The SCDE is generally a below average unit in IHE prestige and status with a weaker bargaining hand in establishing the negotiated state of normalcy. This status position is reinforced by the fact that certain core SCDE activity areas are inherently low status activities in many IHEs, i.e., development, service, undergraduate teaching, and support and nurturance of practitioner groups.

SCDE Responses to Change

1. SCDEs seem quite vulnerable to external pressures for change or requests for assistance. Obviously, they are vulnerable to certification mandates for specific courses for teachers. SCDEs have had an historic commitment to service activities with schools which has often been criticized as too responsive, i.e., a "service station." They have reacted to widely varying patterns of public and private funding. Most larger SCDEs have endeavored to respond to local educational and social problems, e.g., bi-lingual education, urban education, multicultural education, etc.

2. Many of the external thrusts brought to bear on SCDEs, especially funded by change agencies, have been short term uncoordinated change efforts.

They might be described as "light impact" thrusts that do not touch the core of the SCDE's operation, e.g., they are handled by an ad hoc center of cadre of faculty who stay together for the duration of the funding period. The effect of multiple "light impacts" may be substantially over time but is hard to assess on a project-by-project basis.

3. External funds from the federal government and private foundations have been used extensively (especially by doctoral level institutions) to initiate change programs internally. Since such funds are supplemental to the regular institutional budget, they avoid the problem of competing priorities internally and normally can be used for projects on which faculty participation is voluntary. However, the record of institutionalization such activities within SCDEs (or any other educational agency for that matter) after the funds are withdrawn has not been good.

NOTE #9: EXTERNAL IMPACT FACTORS AFFECTING SCDE INVOLVEMENT IN D&U

From a variety of sources, the RITE project staff compiled an inventory of external factors which, they argued, were likely to impact upon SCDEs since they met the criteria of redundancy, i.e., they were cited by multiple data sources as trends or events of significance to SCDEs and cogency, i.e., they were cited forcefully as factors with direct implications for SCDEs. From this inventory, the current investigators have chosen a more limited number which meet the added cirterion of likelihood to affect directly the involvement of SCDEs in dissemination and utilization: These factors are grouped under five general headings, i.e., income and expenditures, status and influence, supply and demand, competition, and governance.

Income and Expenditure Factors

1. Decrease in amount of, or rate of growth in, discretionary funds available from the federal government and private foundations for the support of KPU activities.

2. Altered emphasis from knowledge production (KP) to knowledge utilization (KU) activities in discretionary funding from federal, state, and local sources.

3. Decrease in amount of, or rate of growth in, regular funds accruing from tuition or state appropriations for support of basic instructional activities and/or knowledge production and utilization (KPU) activities.

4. Shift in strategy of federal funding, especially by the National Institute of Education and the U.S. Office of Education, from general support of KPU activities generated on the initiative of individual inquirers and agencies to specification of targeted responses to national educational needs (typically via Requests for Proposals - RFPs).

5. Continuing increases in costs of rendering services of all types, by SCDEs as well as by institutions of higher education in general.

Status and Influence Factors

1. Continuing incredulity about R&D in SCDEs as an effective vehicle to educational improvement in schools.

2. Doubts about the effectiveness of SCDEs in assuming newer KU roles, e.g., as linking agents or agencies, as sites for dissemination activities.

3. Increasing dissatisfaction with SCDE training programs reflecting the continued and increasing public dissatisfaction with the performance of schools in meeting basic social needs.

4. Diminished influence of and reliance upon SCDEs by national governmental executive and legislative agencies.

Personnel Supply and Demand Factors

Increase in demand for educational DU personnel in SEAs, LEAs, and, to a lesser extent, in laboratories and centers, private KU agencies, etc.

Competition Factors

1. Emergence of competitive agencies to carry out DPU activities, e.g., regional educational laboratories, state education agency or local school district research, development, evaluation, and dissemination offices, teacher professional associations and unions, profit and non-profit R&D or consulting firms.

2. Diminished influence of SCDEs relative to other educational agencies, e.g., competitive advantage of private R&D firms in responding to RFPs; capacity-building grants by federal education agencies to state and local education agencies.

3. Emergence of competitive programs of training for the education professions, including federally-sponsored teacher centers, external degree programs, and the direct involvement of LEAs, SEAs, and local and national professional associations of teachers in teacher training.

Governance Factors

Increasing interest in, and pressure from, local school districts and local associations of teachers to play more significant roles in pre-service and in-service education as well as in KPU activities at individual SCDEs.

APPENDIX B

EXEMPLARY DESCRIPTIONS

EXAMPLE #1: SCDE MISSION STATEMENTS

Strong Commitment

The College of Education in consort with other elements of the University will create and apply varied strategies for the utilization of education as an instrument of social change to actualize human potentiality, to achieve ecological harmony, to eliminate poverty, war, and racism, to further the quality of human worth, and to strive for individual and social self-realization.

1. The College of Education will develop, promote, and exemplify futures-oriented educational programs by acquiring, transmitting and implementing new skills and knowledge, and at the same time will utilize ideas of the past that offer insight and direction for the pursuit of meaningful future goals.

2. The College of Education will apply skills and knowledge in real educational situations with demonstrated benefits to learners in those situations (e.g., schools, colleges, other educational and social agencies and their communities).

3. The College of Education, in partnership with other agencies, will provide opportunities for educational personnel to continue professional development throughout their careers.

4. The College of Education will strive to develop and maintain a climate of openness to differing ideas, mutual trust, cooperation, and the giving and receiving of help for educational professionals as they implement the above both within the College and in the field.

5. The College of Education will develop and evaluate the continuing effectiveness of its performance in achieving the above objectives in terms of the quality of learning of its students and faculty, as well as the learning and growth of children, youth, and adults it serves.

Acceptance

The University is committed to: 1) the intellectual, cultural, and professional development of men and women enrolled in its program; 2) the

discovery of new and useful knowledge; and 3) the effective application of knowledge in the development of the state and its people.

These three functions are distinguished as instruction, research, and service, and the effectiveness of each function is strengthened by extensive interaction...

...As an agency of service, the University provides programs of instruction and assistance in application of knowledge throughout the state. Through these activities, the University assists individuals, families, organizations and communities in acquiring and using the latest knowledge. Here theory meets reality in the most practical way.

Little or No Commitment

The Education Department accepts the premise that preparation of good teachers rests on a broad liberal arts education. Within this liberal education specializations should exist that enable the prospective teacher to become competent in a specialized subject area and develop skills in the conveying of this knowledge to another group of persons, commonly called learners.

This Department acknowledges the fact that the preparation of teachers must include persons and organizations outside the institution. Every effort will be made to elicit commentary from the practitioner on the competencies of the product recommended by the Education Department to perform in the public school classroom.

EXAMPLE #2: TRADITIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

Field Service Bureau

These include any bureau or institute within the SCDE indicated by the administrator to be primarily oriented to field service activities. A typical Field Service Bureau characterizes itself as follows:

- Purpose: To be of aid to the elementary, intermediate, and secondary schools of the state...
- Resources: Use of staff of the Bureau of School Services; faculties of the various schools, colleges, bureaus and institutes of the University; and, in some instances, educators from other agencies off campus.
- Cost to Schools: No charge for services supplied by the Bureau's staff; the payment of stipends for projects requiring faculty members from the campus.
- Current Functions: Consultation services (short term), school surveys, specialized consulting help (long term), accreditation, conferences, leadership training workshops (3 per year for high school student leaders).

School Study Councils

School study councils are formal structures involving an SCDE and participating LEAs with a stated goal of improving educational practice in those schools. One such study council seeks its members from county school offices, private and parochial school districts, and colleges or universities having teacher preparation programs located within a 23 county area. This Council provides the following services to its members agencies which pay yearly membership fees of $100-250:

- A conference, workshop, or drive-in each month for subscribing schools and their guests to learn of the results of current innovative practices in education.
- Expert consultants.
- Participation in experimental programs together with assistance in initiation, formulation, and final evaluation.

- Council initiated research findings and other pertinent research data.
- Compensation to teachers to the sum of $25 for the submission of the abstract of an educational innovation which has been practiced or researched in the subscribing school.
- Consultution on formulating and conducting funded research programs in subscribing schools.
- Access to file materials which are loaned to the subscribing school districts.

EXAMPLE #3: OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

The "other" category cannot be adequately typified in a brief presentation, but included:

- Resource Centers
- Demonstration Centers
- Special dissemination arrangements in substantive areas; e.g., early childhood education, community education, bilingual education, etc.
- Linking organizations; e.g., Syracuse University's National Center for Educational Brokering.
- Cooperative educational service agencies
- Centers bridging R&D and D&U functions; e.g., a Center for Research, Evaluation, and Dissemination.

Millersville State College: Stayer Research and Learning Center

The Research and Learning Center at Millersville is designed as a service unit. Its four components are the Elizabeth Jenkins School, a model for Open Education; the Educational Development Center, a unit designed to provide school districts with service; Summer Happening, a unique Open Education training program; and a research component designed to provide consulting services to schools concerning the effectiveness of their programs.

A cooperative venture involving the Pennsylvania Department of Education, Millersville State College and interested Pennsylvania school districts.

"The Elizabeth Jenkins School: A Setting for Involvement"

- To serve as a demonstration model for Open Education.
- To develop materials and techniques for dissemination to public schools.
- To provide a setting for controlled evaluation.
- To serve as a laboratory school for graduate and undergraduate involvement.

"The Educational Development Center"

The Millersville College Educational Development Center serves as a catalyst for educational change in the state. Working in cooperation with school districts, Intermediate Units, and the Department of Education, the Center helps school districts develop plans for changing their programs. The help ranges from mini-workshops to complete in-service packages. The mission of the Educational Development Center is to develop programs to meet the changing needs of the school districts in Pennsylvania.

"Summer Happening: Involvement 1974"

640	Master Teachers
35	Student Teachers
100	Student Aides and Paraprofessionals
18,000	Children

"Research, Evaluation, Dissemination"

The Millersville Research Evaluation and Dissemination component provides consulting services to schools. The primary purpose of the service is to help school districts assess, through data-based approaches, the effectiveness of their curriculum and programs. The component has capabilities to conduct statistical analysis, develop evaluation packages, and provide information about evaluation models.

The University of Connecticut: Educational Resources and Development Center

The Center is to serve as a professional link between the School of Education and local communities. It will assist local communities and their school districts, public and private institutions, and non-profit organizations with solutions to educational problems which may be considered the concern of and within the purview of a school of Education. It is a resource center in that it will accept the challenge of utilizing all appropriate University resources to assist local communities with their educational problems. It is a development center in that it will encourage, assist, and stimulate local community leaders and professional educators to use research findings and to implement the recommendations of research in the solution of these problems.

The total resources of the University are available to local communities and their school districts through the Center. Primarily, faculty members and other resources of the School of Education will be utilized. Where appropriate, faculty members and resources of other schools, institutes, and centers within the University are also available through the Center. The full time staff of the Center consists of a coordinator, four research assistants and a secretary.

EXAMPLE #4: A D&U CENTER INSTITUTION

Mission: Strongly Committed to D&U

> ...the College must be more than just a collection of traditional classrooms. It must be a complex of educational laboratories and continuing seminars where procedures and programs are developed, tested, refined, and made operational. Indeed, for certain activities and programs, the community itself and the schools in it must become the educational laboratories.
> ...Most colleges of education cannot be limited to preparing prospective educational personnel and to conducting systematic studies and research, but must necessarily become intimately involved in cooperative and coordinated research and service activities with the entire educational enterprise. Among these cooperative endeavors are suitable in-service programs for teachers, administrators and specialists in related subject fields. Meaningful assistance to schools and school systems should also be rendered through consultation. These consultative activieies may range all the way from occasional conversations between professors and school staff members to more formal contractual agreements.

Organizational Arrangements: Highly Supportive of D&U Activities

This SCDE maintained three formal structures in support of D&U: a Bureau of School Service, an IGE League of Schools, and service arrangements with schools in which faculty participate as part of their regular load.

Likely success in school settings was considered essential in faculty recruitment.

Service was mentioned as a criterion for promotion and tenure both by the SCDE Chief Administrator and the formal document on promotion and tenure practices.

EXAMPLE #5: A POTENTIAL D&U CENTER INSTITUTION

Acceptance of D&U Activities

(The) University has been designated as one of four major state-supported multidisciplinary universities. The institution's purposes are to provide educational opportunities at the undergraduate, professional, and graduate levels, and to meet the increasing demands for continuing education. Furthermore, it strives to create an atmosphere conducive to scholarly and scientific research.

Organizational Arrangements: Highly Supportive of D&U

This SCDE maintained three formal structures in support of D&U: a Center for Dissemination and Experimentation, a cooperative project with area community colleges and LEAs, and service arrangements with schools in which faculty members participate as a part of their regular load.

Likely success in school settings was considered essential in faculty recruitment.

Service was mentioned as a criterion for promotion and tenure by both the SCDE Chief Administrator and the formal statement on promotion and tenure.

Process: Some Faculty Involved

A large number of faculty at this SCDE(62%) were involved in rendering ad hoc services to schools, although the local schools made service requests only occasionally to the SCDE. Less than half (35%) of the faculty were engaged in publishing in practitioner-oriented journals and making presentations at practitioner-oriented conferences. Only a few served in an editorial capacity for practitioner-oriented journals.

Process: Most Faculty Involved with D&U Activities

More than three quarters of the faculty at this SCDE were involved in rendering ad hoc services to schools, and schools made frequent service requests to the SCDE. In addition to this direct contact with schools and school personnel, a large number of faculty (61%) made presentations at practitioner-oriented conferences. Smaller proportions (39% and 20%) were active in publishing and editing practitioner-oriented journals.

Productivity: High Producer

This SCDE ranked eighth overall in the sample on the three measures of productivity. Over a three year period 29 articles in the 13 selected practitioner-oriented journals were written by SCDE professors at this institution. During a two year period RIE accepted five KU contributions from this SCDE. In a similar period, faculty members made three practitioner-oriented presentations at six national conventions.

EXAMPLE #5: A POTENTIAL D&U CENTER INSTITUTION

Acceptance of D&U Activities

(The) University has been designated as one of four major state-supported multidisciplinary universities. The institution's purposes are to provide educational opportunities at the undergraduate, professional, and graduate levels, and to meet the increasing demands for continuing education. Furthermore, it strives to create an atmosphere conducive to scholarly and scientific research.

Organizational Arrangements: Highly Supportive of D&U

This SCDE maintained three formal structures in support of D&U: a Center for Dissemination and Experimentation, a cooperative project with area community colleges and LEAs, and service arrangements with schools in which faculty members participate as a part of their regular load.

Likely success in school settings was considered essential in faculty recruitment.

Service was mentioned as a criterion for promotion and tenure by both the SCDE Chief Administrator and the formal statement on promotion and tenure.

Process: Some Faculty Involved

A large number of faculty at this SCDE (62%) were involved in rendering ad hoc services to schools, although the local schools made service requests only occasionally to the SCDE. Less than half (35%) of the faculty were engaged in publishing in practitioner-oriented journals and making presentations at practitioner-oriented conferences. Only a few served in an editorial capacity for practitioner-oriented journals.

Productivity: High Producer

This SCDE ranked sixtheenth among the SCDEs in the sample on three measures of productivity. Ten articles in a group of thirteen national practitioner-oriented journals over a three year period and eleven KU-oriented contributions to RIE over a two year period were credited to this institution. During a two year period faculty members made five practitioner-oriented presentations at six national conferences.

EXAMPLE #6: A MINIMALLY INVOLVED INSTITUTION

Mission: Little or No Commitment to D&U

The formal document made no mention of KU activity areas.

Organizational Arrangements: Moderately Supportive of D&U

The only formal structure supporting D&U maintained by this SCDE was a service arrangement with local schools in which faculty participates as part of their regular load.

Likely success in school settings was considered essential in faculty recruitment.

The formal document on promotion and tenure criteria made no mention of KU activities, and the administrator did not consider service to be a criterion in such decisions.

Process: Few Faculty Involved

Despite the SCDE chief administrator's estimate that LEAs made only occasional service requests to the SCDEs, many of the faculty had been recently involved in rendering ad hoc services to schools. No faculty members indicated involvement in publishing in practitioner-oriented journals or making presentations at practitioner-oriented conferences.

Productivity: Low Producer

This SCDE ranked 65.5 overall in the sample on three measures of productivity. Over the three year period only one article in the group of thirteen practitioner-oriented journals originated at this SCDE. During a two year period no faculty member had a KU-oriented contribution accepted by RIE and no faculty member made a practitioner-oriented presentation at one of the six national conventions.

EXAMPLE #6: A MINIMALLY INVOLVED INSTITUTION

Mission: Little or No Commitment to D&U

The formal document made no mention of KU activity areas.

Organizational Arrangements: Moderately Supportive of D&U

The only formal structure supporting D&U maintained by this SCDE was a service arrangement with local schools in which faculty participates as part of their regular load.

Likely success in school settings was considered essential in faculty recruitment.

The formal document on promotion and tenure criteria made no mention of KU activities, and the administrator did not consider service to be a criterion in such decisions.

Process: Few Faculty Involved

Despite the SCDE chief administrator's estimate that LEAs made only occasional service requests to the SCDEs, many of the faculty had been recently involved in rendering ad hoc services to schools. No faculty members indicated involvement in publishing in practitioner-oriented journals or making presentations at practitioner-oriented conferences.

Productivity: Low Producer

This SCDE ranked 65.5 overall in the sample on three measures of productivity. Over the three year period only one article in the group of thirteen practitioner-oriented journals originated at this SCDE. During a two year period no faculty member had a KU-oriented contribution accepted by RIE and no faculty member made a practitioner-oriented presentation at one of the six national conventions.